DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 115 376 PS 008 193

TITLE	Child Care: Data and Materials.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. Senate Committee on Finance.
PUB DATE	Oct 74
NOTE	267p.; Revised edition of document prepared by the staff for the use of the Committee on Finance (U.S. Senate, 93rd Congress, 2nd Session)
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (Stock No. 5270-02549, $2.55)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$13.32 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	Certification; *Child Care; Child Care Centers; *Child Welfare; *Day Care Services; *Early Childhood Education; Family Day Care; Family Income; Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; Government Role; National Surveys; State Standards; *Statistical Data; Working Women

ABSTRACT

This report presents current statistics, reports, statutory language, and regulations pertaining to child care in the United States in 1974. A short summary precedes the numerous tables which compose nearly three-quarters of the report. These tables illustrate the following kinds of data: (1) the number and status of children needing child care; (2) the number of women in the labor force, both in female-headed and husband-wife families, particularly in relation to status and income; (3) child care arrangements available (with approximate usage), including preprimary schools, child care centers, family day care and home care, with particular reference to the care of children under six years of age; (4) federal involvement in child care, including type of involvement and fiscal level; and (5) current state and federal licensing standards and regulations. The appendices include excerpts from various reports that either were used in compiling the data or are included to elucidate certain issues. (ED)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED115376

93d Congress }
2d Session } COMMITTEE PRINT

CHILD CARE

DATA AND MATERIALS

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
UNITED STATES SENATE
Russell B. Long, Chairman

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PS 008193

OCTOBER 1974

Prepared by the staff for the use of the Committee on Finance

88-877

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1974

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402 - Price $2.55
Stock Number 5270-02549

2/3

UNITED STATES SENATE
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

(NINETY-THIRD CONGRESS)

RUSSELL B. LONG, Louisiana, *Chairman*

HERMAN E. TALMADGE, Georgia
VANCE HARTKE, Indiana
J. W. FULBRIGHT, Arkansas
ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, Connecticut
HARRY F. BYRD, Jr., Virginia
GAYLORD NELSON, Wisconsin
WALTER F. MONDALE, Minnesota
LLOYD BENTSEN, Texas

WALLACE F. BENNETT, Utah
CARL T. CURTIS, Nebraska
PAUL J. FANNIN, Arizona
CLIFFORD P. HANSEN, Wyoming
ROBERT DOLE, Kansas
BOB PACKWOOD, Oregon
WILLIAM V. ROTH, Jr., Delaware

Michael Stern, *Staff Director*

First edition, June 1971
Second edition, October 1974

FOREWORD

For many years, the Committee on Finance has been involved in issues relating to child care. The committee has been dealing with child care as a segment of the child welfare program under the Social Security Act since the original enactment of that act in 1935. Over the years, authorizations for child welfare funds have been increased in legislation acted on by the committee.

Since the early 1960's legislation handled by the Committee on Finance has placed an increased stress on child care services for the children of working mothers. This occurred in the public welfare amendments of 1962, in which child welfare funds were specifically earmarked for child care for working mothers. In the 1967 Social Security Amendments, the committee anticipated a substantial expansion of child care services as part of the new work incentive program. To further encourage expansion of child care services, the Federal matching share for child care services under the work incentive program was increased from 75 to 90 percent in legislation enacted in 1971.

The program of social services under the Social Security Act experienced a tremendous growth in the early 1970's. An estimated one-quarter of the Federal funds under that program are being used to provide child care services.

Tax legislation enacted in 1971 provides substantial tax relief to working mothers who may now deduct the cost of child care needed to enable them to work. The amendment liberalizing this tax deduction originated in the Committee on Finance.

Today, child care provided under the Social Security Act constitutes the major Federal support for the care of children of working parents. Through its support of child welfare legislation and programs, the committee has shown its interest, too, in the quality of care which children receive.

Despite widespread interest in child care, current information on child care is often not conveniently available to persons involved in child care research, planning, and operation. In 1971 the Committee on Finance published a document designed to fill the void by bringing together in one publication the most important current statistics, reports, statutory language, and regulations on child care. Supplies of that document have long since been exhausted. It is my hope that persons interested in child care will find this new document helpful and informative.

RUSSELL B. LONG, *Chairman.*

CONTENTS

Page

Child care services for working mothers 1
  Number of children 1
  Children of working mothers 1
  Increase in number of working mothers 2
  Family size as a factor 2
  Education and labor force attachment 3
  Growth in employment 4
  Attitudes toward working 4
  Female heads of families 5
  Economic motivation 5
  Welfare mothers 6
Child care arrangements today 7
  Kinds of care 8
  Care in centers 9
  Care in day care homes 12
  Other preschool programs 13
  After school and summer care 18
Child care costs 18
  Studies of costs 18
  The issue of fee schedules 21
Federal involvement in child care 22
  Background 22
  Social services (title IV, pt. A, of the Social Security Act) 22
  Child care as a work expense (title IV, pt. A, of the Social Security Act) 23
  Work incentive program (title IV, pt. C, of the Social Security Act) 24
  Child welfare services (title IV, pt. B, of the Social Security Act) 24
  Headstart 25
  Training of personnel 25
  Other Federal programs relating to child care 26
  Tax provisions relating to child care 28
Standards and licensing 29
  Federal interagency day care requirements 29
  Licensing 30

LIST OF TABLES

Child Care Services for Working Mothers

	Page
TABLE 1.—NUMBER OF CHILDREN UNDER 18 YEARS OLD, BY AGE, TYPE OF FAMILY, LABOR FORCE STATUS OF MOTHER, AND RACE, MARCH 1970 AND MARCH 1973	34
Since 1970, the number of children has declined by about 1.4 million while the number of children whose mothers are in the labor force has increased by about 0.6 million. Most of this increase is among white children in female-headed families.	
TABLE 2.—NUMBER OF CHILDREN WITH MOTHERS IN THE LABOR FORCE, BY AGE, 1965–73	36
The number of children of working mothers has grown by more than 50 percent since 1965 with the larger part of this increase being among school age children.	
TABLE 3.—CHILDREN UNDER AGE 6 WITH MOTHERS IN THE LABOR FORCE, 1970–73	36
Thirty one percent of all preschool children have a mother who is working or looking for work.	
TABLE 4.—LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATES OF MOTHERS, SELECTED YEARS	37
From 1950 to 1973, the proportion of mothers who were working or looking for work increased from 22 to 44 percent—a 100-percent increase in labor force participation.	
TABLE 5.—LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATES OF MARRIED WOMEN, HUSBAND PRESENT, BY PRESENCE AND AGE OF CHILDREN, MARCH 1960 TO 1973	38
In 1960, wives with no children under age 18 were significantly more likely to be working or looking for work than those with children; by 1973 the labor force participation rates of the two groups were roughly the same (43 and 42 percent). Labor force participation of wives with children under age 3 nearly doubled in this period.	

Page

TABLE 6.—NUMBER OF MOTHERS PARTICIPATING IN THE LABOR FORCE, BY AGE OF CHILDREN, 1966–1973 ---------- 39

The number of mothers who are working or looking for work has increased by 3.1 million over the past 7 years.

TABLE 7.—MOTHERS IN THE LABOR FORCE, BY MARITAL STATUS AND AGE OF CHILDREN, MARCH 1972 AND 1973 ---------- 40

Of mothers who are working or looking for work, 37 percent have preschool children (including 20 percent who have children under age 3)

TABLE 8.—LABOR FORCE STATUS OF WOMEN WHO HAVE EVER BEEN MARRIED BY PRESENCE AND AGE OF CHILDREN, MARCH 1973 ---------- 42

As of March 1973, 53 percent of mothers with schoolage children only and 34 percent of mothers with pre-school-age children were working or looking for work: among minority races 61 percent of mothers of school age children only and 49 percent of mothers of pre-school-age children were working or looking for work.

TABLE 9.—FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN: HUSBAND-WIFE FAMILIES AND FEMALE-HEADED FAMILIES: 1960–1973 ---------- 43

The number of husband-wife families with children, after increasing by 9 percent from 1960 to 1970, has been declining slightly since then. The number of female-headed families has been increasing over the entire period with an 81 percent increase since 1960 and a 30 percent increase from 1970 to 1973.

TABLE 10.—NUMBER OF FAMILIES AND AVERAGE NUMBER OF OWN CHILDREN UNDER 18 YEARS OLD, BY TYPE OF FAMILY, LABOR FORCE STATUS OF MOTHER, AND RACE, MARCH 1970 AND MARCH 1973 ---------- 44

While the number of husband-wife families with children declined between 1970 and 1973, the number of mothers in such families who were working or looking for work increased. Among female-headed families, the rate of labor force participation of mothers remained essentially unchanged over this period although the number of such mothers working or looking for work increased, since the number of female-headed families increased from 2.9 to 3.8 million.

TABLE 11.—WORK EXPERIENCE IN 1972 OF MARRIED WOMEN, HUSBAND PRESENT, BY PRESENCE AND AGE OF CHILDREN, AND RACE, MARCH 1973 ---------- 46

About 13 million mothers in husband-wife families worked at some time during 1972. About 4½ million of these women worked in full-time, full-year employment.

Page

Table 12.—Number of Married Women With Minor Children in the Population and in the Labor Force, by Years of School Completed, March 1972 47

Labor force participation of wives with schoolage children ranges from 45 percent for women who are not high school graduates to 60 percent for women who have completed at least 4 years of college.

Table 13.—Labor Force Participation Rates and Percent Distribution of Mothers (Husband Present), by Income of Husband in 1972 and Ages of Children, March 1973 48

In husband-wife families, one-fourth of all mothers in the labor force have husbands with income below $7,000. The rate of labor force participation of mothers in husband-wife families is approximately 45 percent for families where the husband's income is between $3,000 and $10,000.

Table 14.—Number of Children Under 18 Years Old, Median Family Income in 1972, Type of Family, Labor Force Status of Parents, and Race, March 1973 . 49

In 1972, median family income was 14 percent higher for children in two-parent families where the mother was in the labor force than where she was not; in female-headed families, median income was 64 percent higher if the mother was in the labor force.

Table 15.—Income Distribution of Husband-Wife Families, by Whether or Not Wife Had Earnings, 1959 and 1972 51

In 1959, in husband-wife families with a wife who worked at some time during the year, 19 percent of the families had annual income under $4,000 and 4 percent had annual income of $15,000 or more. In 1972, in the same type of family, 3.4 percent had income below $4,000 and 41 percent had income of $15,000 or more.

Table 16.—Income Distribution of Female-Headed Families, by Presence or Absence of Earners, 1959, 1969, and 1972 52

Average income of female-headed families with some earnings increased by 75 percent between 1959 and 1972; for female-headed families with no earnings there was a 116 percent increase in average income over this same period.

Table 17.—Children Receiving Aid to Families With Dependent Children (AFDC), by Age, 1971 and 1973 53

Preschool age children constitute 35 percent of the number of children receiving AFDC.

Page

TABLE 18.—FAMILIES RECEIVING AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN BY AGE GROUP OF YOUNGEST CHILD IN FAMILY, 1973 ________________________________ 53

Of the 3 million AFDC families, 1.8 million (60 percent) include at least one child under age 6.

TABLE 19.—AFDC FAMILIES, BY NUMBER OF CHILDREN RECEIVING AID, 1971 AND 1973 ____________________________ 54

Six out of every 10 AFDC families have one or two recipient children.

TABLE 20.—AFDC FAMILIES WITH MOTHER IN HOME, BY MOTHER'S EMPLOYMENT STATUS, 1973, FOR HEW REGIONS AND SELECTED STATES __________________ 55

In 1973, 28 percent of AFDC mothers were working (full or part time) or were looking for work.

Child Care Arrangements Today

TABLE 21.—NUMBER AND CAPACITY OF LICENSED OR APPROVED DAY CARE CENTERS AND FAMILY DAY CARE HOMES, 1967–1972 ____ 58

As of 1972, licensed or approved day care centers and family day care homes had a total capacity of 1,021,202. This represents a 115-percent increase over the past 5 years.

TABLE 22.—LICENSED OR APPROVED DAY CARE CENTERS, BY AUSPICES AND CAPACITY, BY STATE, MARCH 1972_______ 60

As of March 1972, seven States accounted for over half of the Nation's capacity for child care in licensed or approved day care centers.

TABLE 23.—LICENSED OR APPROVED FAMILY DAY CARE HOMES, BY AUSPICES AND CAPACITY, BY STATE, MARCH 1972___ 62

For March 1972, States reported 61,000 licensed or approved family day care homes with a capacity of caring for 216,000 children.

TABLE 24.—ESTIMATED CHANGES IN SOCIAL SERVICES EXPENDITURES UNDER TITLE IV–A OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1971–72__________________________ 64

Between fiscal year 1971 and fiscal year 1972, State child care expenditures under the social services program increased by an estimated 76 percent.

TABLE 25.—PREPRIMARY SCHOOL ENROLLMENT OF CHILDREN 3 TO 5 YEARS OLD, BY FAMILY INCOME, OCCUPATION OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD, PLACE OF RESIDENCE, AND RACE, 1964–72________________________________ 65

Between 1964 and 1972, the proportion of 3- to 5-year-old children enrolled in preprimary school programs increased from 25.5 percent to 41.6 percent.

Table 26.—Preprimary School Enrollment of Children 3 to 5 Years Old, by Control of Program, Age, and Race, October 1973 .... Page 67

As of October 1973, there were 4.2 million 3- to 5-year-old children enrolled in preprimary school programs including 2.8 million in public programs and 1.4 million in nonpublic programs.

Table 27.—Preprimary School Enrollment of Children 3 to 5 Years Old by Region, Age, and Race, October 1973 68

The proportion of 3- to 5-year-old children enrolled in school programs varies from 40 percent in the South to [illegible]3 percent in the West: for 5-year-olds the proportion varies from 68 percent in the South to 84.5 percent in the North Central.

Table 28.—Preprimary School Enrollment of Children 3 to 5 Years Old in Full-Day and Part-Day Attendance, by Age and Race, October 1973 69

Seventy-seven percent of the 4 million children age 3 to 5 in school programs attend on a part-day basis.

Federal Involvement in Child Care

Table 29.—Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Estimate of National Child Care Funding, Fiscal Years 1974 and 1975 70

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates indicate child care funding for fiscal 1974 of $1.3 billion in Federal obligations and $0.3 billion non-Federal. This does not include a number of items for which estimates were not available and does not include any nongovernmental expenditures.

Table 30.—Child Care Funded Under Part A of Title IV of the Social Security Act, Fiscal Years 1970 Through 1974 78

Federal funding of child care through the AFDC program increased from $144 million in 1970 to $594 million in 1974. The greatest part of this increase was in the AFDC social services program.

Table 31.—Social Services Under Title IV, Part A of the Social Security Act: Day Care—Estimated Federal Share of Costs, Average Number of Children, and Average Cost Per Child—Fiscal Years 1973 and 1974 (Excluding Child Care Under the Work Incentive Program) 80

Nationally, Federal expenditures for child care through the social services program in fiscal 1973 totaled $371 million, an average of $813 per child served. The average Federal cost per child served ranged from a low of $181 in Wyoming to $2,263 in Pennsylvania.

Page

TABLE 32.—NUMBER OF CHILDREN REPORTED RECEIVING CHILD CARE UNDER THE WORK INCENTIVE PROGRAM ______ 84

From 1969 to 1973 the number of children receiving child care under the WIN program has grown from about 53,000 to about 164,000.

TABLE 33.—CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS REPORTED UNDER THE WORK INCENTIVE PROGRAM, BY TYPE OF ARRANGEMENT ______ 88

The proportion of children getting child care under the WIN program who are provided such care in their own home or the home of a relative has remained at about 50-60 percent over the course of the program. This is the case with respect to both school age and preschool age children.

TABLE 34.—NUMBER OF MOTHERS OR OTHER CARETAKERS PARTICIPATING IN THE WIN PROGRAM AND NUMBER OF THEIR CHILDREN PROVIDED CHILD CARE, BY AGE GROUP AND BY STATE, AS OF THE LAST DAY OF THE QUARTER ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1973 ______ 92

As of December 31, 1973, 140,000 children of 67,000 WIN participants were receiving child care; 56,000 of these children (40 percent) were under age 6.

TABLE 35.—NUMBER OF MOTHERS OR OTHER CARETAKERS WHO COULD NOT BE CERTIFIED TO THE STATE MANPOWER AGENCY FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE WIN PROGRAM SOLELY BECAUSE ADEQUATE CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS WERE NOT AVAILABLE AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN REQUIRING CHILD CARE, BY AGE GROUP, AND BY STATE, AS OF THE LAST DAY OF THE QUARTER ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1974 ______ 94

Unavailability of child care was the only factor preventing [illegible]500 adult AFDC recipients from participating in the work incentive program as of December 31, 1973. This is based on State reports which vary widely even as among large States; for example Michigan reports 65 such cases while Texas reports 541 and New York did not report.

TABLE 36.—CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS, BY TYPE OF ARRANGEMENT AND AGE GROUP, FOR CHILDREN OF WORK INCENTIVE PROGRAM (WIN) PARTICIPANTS AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1973 ______ 96

Child care arrangements under the WIN program provided for care in the child's own home or the home of a relative with respect to 70,000 children; care for 35,000 children was provided in day-care facilities; and other arrangements were used for 32,000 children.

Page

Table 37.—Child Care Provided Under Child Welfare Services Program (Title IV–B of the Social Security Act) -- 97

The number of children receiving day care under the child welfare services program (as of December 31) increased from 19,000 in 1968 to 35,000 in 1971 and then declined to 19,000 in 1973.

Table 38.—Children in Full-Year, Full-Day Head Start Programs, by State, Fiscal Year 1973, and Federal Costs -- 98

Head Start provided full-year, full-day care for 118,000 children at a cost of $123 million ($1,041 per child) in 1973. In individual States unit costs ranged from $69 to $2,222.

Table 39.—Department of Agriculture Special Food Service Program for Children—Year-Round (Day Care and Head Start) Segment---------------------- 100

Agriculture Department food programs contributed $20 million toward the food costs of day care programs in fiscal 1974; the 1975 Federal budget estimates a large increase in this amount for fiscal 1975.

Table 40.—Estimated Reduction in Tax Liability Because of Deductibility of Child and Dependent Care Expenses, 1972-------------------------- 102

The tax deduction for child care expenses to enable the taxpayer to work resulted in reduced Federal tax liability of $224 million in 1972.

Table 41.—Number of Taxable Returns and Amount of Deduction Under the Federal Individual Income Tax Provisions for a Deduction for the Care of Dependent Children, Disabled Dependents, and Disabled Spouses-------------------------------- 103

In 1972, child and dependent care expenses claimed as deductions on tax returns totalled more than $1 billion.

Standards and Licensing

Table 42.—Licensing of Child Care Centers Offering Group Care Under State Licensing Regulations------ 104

State-by-State variations in facilities which are required to be licensed and list of political subdivisions with separate requirements.

Page

TABLE 43.—CHILD CARE CENTERS: MINIMUM STAFFING REQUIREMENTS, BY AGE OF CHILDREN, UNDER STATE LICENSING REGULATIONS 120

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's model standards would permit no more than 12 school age children per staff member in child care. Ten States have standards which meet this recommendation.

TABLE 44.—QUALIFICATIONS OF CHILD CARE CENTER STAFF REQUIRED UNDER STATE LICENSING REGULATIONS 124

States vary as to minimum age and educational requirements for child care center directors and other staff members.

TABLE 45.—FACILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR CHILD CARE CENTERS OFFERING FULL-DAY GROUP CARE UNDER STATE LICENSING REGULATIONS 138

State standards vary as to amount of space required per child, permissible location, necessity of hot meals, outdoor fencing, isolation facilities, and cots for naps.

TABLE 46.—STATE LICENSING REGULATIONS CONCERNING FAMILY DAY CARE HOMES 142

State standards vary as to permissible number of children, type of facilities, and staff qualifications.

NOTE

Because of the variety of the sources of information presented in this document, the reliability of the data may vary considerably among the different tables. Even where the reliability of statistics on child care has left something to be desired, they have been included where no other information is available.

APPENDIXES

Appendix A—Excerpts From "Child Care Arrangements of Working Mothers in the United States" 151
Appendix B—Excerpts From Day Care Survey 1970: Summary Report and Basic Analysis, Presented to the Office of Economic Opportunity by the Westinghouse Learning Corporation, April 1971 159
Appendix C—Standards and Costs for Day Care 177
Appendix D—Excerpts From a Study on the Cost of Child Care Submitted to the Office of Child Development by the Inner City Fund 185
Appendix E—Excerpts From "Sliding Fee Schedules, A Simulation Analysis of Child Care Service and Cost Under Welfare Reform," Prepared for the Office of Child Development by ABT Associates, Inc., July 1972 209
Appendix F—Excerpts From "Regulation of Early Childhood Programs" by Gwen C. Morgan 215
Appendix G—Excerpts From The Social Security Act .. 231
Appendix H—Excerpts From Regulations of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Concerning Child Care Services Under Title IV of the Social Security Act 237
Appendix I—Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements 249

CHILD CARE

Child Care Services for Working Mothers

Child care has been attracting increasing attention in recent years. Two important reasons for this are the growth in the number of children whose mothers work and the realization that child care services must be available if families on welfare are to be helped to move toward economic self-sufficiency.

Number of children.—In March 1973 there were 19,145,000 children under 6 years of age in the United States. About 10 million of those were age 3 to 5, the usual age for pre-school child care. Another 45,158,000 children were age 6 to 17, for whom full-time care would not be necessary, but who might require after-school or summer programs (until age 13 or 14). *Table 1, p. 34*

Children of working mothers.—The children who could be assumed to be most in need of child care services are children of working mothers. There were 26,189,000 children under age 18 in March 1973 whose mothers were in the labor force. Of these, 5,952,000 children were under age 6. The number of children under age 6 with working mothers has been growing steadily in recent years, increasing from 4.5 million in 1965. The percent of children in this age group whose mothers are in the labor force increased from 28.5 in 1970 to 31.1 in 1973. Thus nearly one out of every three children in the United States under age 6 has a mother in the labor force. The proportion is higher for those approaching 6 than for the youngest children, since the labor force participation rate for mothers with children over 3 is higher than for those with children under 3. *Tables 1–3, pp. 34–36*

Nearly 45 percent of all children 6 to 17 years old had mothers in the labor force in March 1973, and about 41 percent of all children under age 18 had mothers in the labor force at that time.

Department of Labor statistics also show that although the total number of children under age 18 has been decreasing in recent years (dropping from 65,755,000 in 1970 to 64,303,000 in 1973), the number of children whose mothers are in the labor force has actually increased from 25,544,000 in 1970 to 26,189,000 in 1973.

In evaluating the significance of these labor force participation figures, it should be remembered that the Department of Labor counts an individual as in the labor force if he is employed, or unemployed and looking for work. Thus the children referred to above had mothers who in March 1973 were either working full time, working part time, or not working but seeking employment.

Table 4, p. 37

Increase in number of working mothers.—Labor force participation of women has increased dramatically in recent years. The labor force participation rate of mothers (who have ever been married) with children under 18 increased from 22 percent in 1950 to 34 percent in 1964 to 44 percent in 1973. Although mothers with school-age children are more likely to be in the labor force than mothers with younger children, both groups have shown large increases. The participation of mothers with children age 6 to 17 increased from 46 percent in 1964 to 53 percent in 1973. Even more striking, the participation rate of mothers with children under age 6 climbed from 25 percent in 1964 to 34 percent in 1973.

Table 5, p. 38

Data indicate that mothers tend to return to the labor force rather rapidly as their youngest child leaves infancy. According to Department of Labor statistics, 29.4 percent of married women with children under 3, whose husbands are present, participated in the labor force in March 1973. This rate increased to 38.3 percent for those who have children between ages 3 to 5, but who have no children under 3. The rate was 50.1 percent for those married women (living with their husbands) who had children between the ages of 6 to 17 only.

Tables 6–8, pp. 39–42

The actual number, as well as the rate, of mothers participating in the labor force has also been growing rapidly. In March 1966, for example, 9.9 million mothers with children under 18 were in the labor force. In 1969 this number had grown to 11.6 million. In 1971 the number was 12.2 million, and in March 1973 the total was 13 million.

Table 10, p. 44

Family size as a factor.—There is reason to believe that, at least in the near future, the number of working mothers will continue to increase. One factor in this is the trend toward smaller families. The average size of families in the United States has been declining in the last decade. That this may be a continuing trend is illustrated by the following table:

Wife's age	Percent having or expecting to have more than 2 births
18 through 19	29.3
20 through 21	31.4
22 through 24	29.9
25 through 29	36.9
30 through 34	52.7
35 through 39	62.5

Source: Bureau of the Census, "*Current Population Reports,*" Series P–20, No. 265, June 1974.

With fewer children, and the childbearing and childrearing years thereby shortened, it can be assumed that more and more mothers will consider the possibility of becoming more or less permanently attached to the work force. (A large percentage of mothers, and of working women in general, work less than full time and less than full year.) *Table 11, p. 46*

Education and labor force attachment.—Labor force participation generally increases with the level of education attained. *Table 12, p. 47* For example, of all women 16 years of age and over in the population who had completed less than 8 years of schooling, less than 1 out of 4 was in the labor force in 1972. But half of those who had completed high school were in the labor force. For those who had 4 years of college the percentage was 57, and 68 percent of women who had 5 years or more of college were in the labor force.

The rise in educational attainment of women could therefore be expected to lead toward a higher labor force participation rate for all women, including mothers. A higher level of education does generally increase earning capacity, which is particularly important to working mothers, whose costs of working, including child care, may be relatively high.

The following figures illustrate the trend toward greater educational attainment by women. In 1972, nearly three-fifths of all women 25 years or over had completed at least a high school education. Less than one-half had achieved this level in 1962. Nearly 20 percent of women in this age group had completed some college in 1972, compared to 16 percent 10 years earlier. For women ages 20 to 24, 34 percent had completed at least 1 year of college in 1972, compared with 22 percent in 1962.

Growth in employment.—Another factor contributing to the increasing participation by women in the labor force is the increase in number of jobs open to women, and particularly the growth in service jobs which have been considered appropriate for women. (Employment in the service sector of the economy increased by 77 percent from 1950 to 1970.)

Attitudes toward working.—Although it is impossible to pinpoint cause and effect, it should be noted that along with the increase in the number and percentage of mothers who work has come a change in attitude toward the working mother. It has become more acceptable, among some segments of society at least, for mothers of young children to work.

This changing attitude seems to go hand in hand with what young women themselves expect their futures to hold. Illustrative of the growing expectation of young women, especially educated young women, to have careers, irrespective of the presence of children, are the following descriptions of student attitudes.

> A women's college that has administered questionnaires each year since 1964 to the entering freshman class reported that 65 percent of the 1964 class said they would like to be a housewife with one or more children. Over the years, there has been a steady decline in the percentage choosing this lifestyle—the percentages subscribing to a future as housewife and mother in subsequent years are as follows: 65, 61, 60, 53, 52, 46, 31. Two other alternatives increased in popularity: the percentage wanting to be a married career woman with children doubled, going from 20 percent in 1964 to 40 percent in 1970, and the percentage that were uncertain increased from 13 to 22 percent (Cross, 1971, p. 147).
>
> Data relating to 1972 Stanford women graduates are even more dramatic. A study released by the university's Committee on the Education and Employment of Women showed that fewer than 1 out of every 25 women expected to be a full-time housewife in 5 years. In a 1965 survey, 70 percent of Stanford women said they would not work at all when their children were under the age of 6, and only 45 percent intended to work full time when their children were over the age of 12. Among the 1972 graduates, only 3 percent of the women said they would stop working when their

husbands had finished school and only 7 percent said they would stop working to rear children. In all, only 18.5 percent of the 1972 women graduates mentioned the role of wife and mother as part of their plans for the next 5 years.

Source: *Opportunities for Women in Higher Education*, A Report and Recommendations by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, McGraw-Hill Book Co., September 1973, p. 31.

Tables 9–10, pp. 43–45

Female heads of families.—Mothers who are the heads of families have a higher labor force participation rate than mothers in husband-wife families. In March 1973 there were 3,796,000 female headed families with children under 18, of which 2,225,000, or about 59 percent, had a mother in the labor force. This contrasts with the approximately 42 percent of husband-wife families in which the mother was in the labor force. In addition, the actual number of female headed families with children has been growing rapidly. In March 1970 there were 2,924,000 families with children under 18 which had a female family head. In March 1973 the number had risen to 3,796,000 such families, or an increase of about 30 percent.

At the same time that the number of female-headed families with children has been growing, the number of husband-wife families with children has been decreasing. In March 1970, there were 25,547,000 such husband-wife families; by March of 1973, this number had fallen to 25,395,000. As a result of these two trends of more female-headed families and fewer husband-wife families, the proportion of female-headed families has increased from 10 percent of all families with children in 1970 to 13 percent in 1973.

Table 13, p. 48

Economic motivation.—Most mothers who are heads of families have to work (or choose the alternative of going on welfare) in order to support themselves and their children. The motivation to work of mothers in families in which the father is present and earning is less clear, although the income derived is probably an important factor in most cases. Interestingly, however, the labor force participation rates of these mothers vary very little over a wide range of husband's annual earnings, from $3,000 to $10,000. Within this range, the rates vary between 44 to 46 percent according to husband's earnings. Only when the husband's earnings exceed $10,000 does the rate drop significantly, to 37.7 percent.

Table 14, p. 49

There is a relationship between the mother's labor force status and the family's income, however. Among white children in two-parent families, median family income in 1972 was $14,198 when the mother was in the labor force and only $12,441 when she was not. For black children the figures were $11,027 and $7,837.

Table 15, p. 51 Over the past decade, the role of the mother's earnings in determining the level of family income appears to have changed substantially, particularly at the lower and upper ranges of income distribution. In 1959, a husband-wife family in which the wife had no earnings was almost twice as likely to have income below $4,000 as a family with a working wife. By 1972, the proportion of husband-wife families with incomes below that level was nearly four times as great for families in which the wife did not work as for families in which the wife was employed. Similarly, by 1972 families with a working wife were far more likely to have incomes above $15,000, while in 1959 families with a working wife were actually slightly less likely to have incomes above $15,000.

Table 16, p. 52 The trends relating to female-headed families seem to be less pronounced. While the proportion of husband-wife families in which the wife had earnings increased from 36 percent of all such families in 1959 to 48 percent in 1972, the percentage of female-headed families with one or more earners declined slightly over the same period, from 78 percent to 75 percent. During these years, there was also a substantial increase in the number of female-headed families participating in the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program, and assistance levels under this program were substantially raised. As a result of these (and perhaps other) factors, the employment of mothers may not have had as significant an impact on income distribution among female-headed families as it has had among husband-wife families.

Table 17, p. 53 *Welfare mothers.*—There has been increasing interest in training and employment for mothers receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC); in both cases children in AFDC families require child care services. According to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's 1973 AFDC study, there were about 7,725,000 children in AFDC families, 80.3 percent of whom were under age 14, and 34.8 percent under age 6. This age distribution of AFDC children is not markedly different from 1971 when 80.1 percent of recipient children were under age 14 and 34.2 percent were under age 6. More than a third of all AFDC families include a child under age 3 and another 23 percent of AFDC families have a child

Table 18, p. 53

aged 3 to 5, making a total of 6 out of every 10 AFDC families with at least one pre-school-age child.

Table 19, p. 54

There has, however, been a significant change in the size of AFDC families between 1971 and 1973. The average family size has declined from 2.8 children per family in 1971 to 2.6 children per family in 1973. The percentage of AFDC families with only one child has increased from 29.7 to 33.8 percent, while the percentage with 3 or more children had declined from 45.8 to 40.7 percent. Thus, by 1973, one- or two-children families, for whom child care arrangements might be considered less difficult to arrange, accounted for 59.3 percent of all AFDC families. This change in family size reflects the fact that AFDC mothers are younger and are having children at a younger age. It is not yet clear whether the changes between 1971 and 1973 represent true long-term developments.

Table 20, p. 55

The percent of AFDC mothers working part or full time has also been increasing in recent years. In 1971, 13.9 percent of mothers worked (8.3 percent full time), compared with 16.1 percent (9.8 percent full time) in 1973. Another 11.5 percent in 1973 were actively seeking work. This, however, compares with 44 percent of all mothers with children under 18 who are in the labor force.

The percentage of mothers who work varies greatly from State to State. For example, in Nebraska 34.6 percent of AFDC mothers are working (25.1 percent full-time) while in Ohio 7.3 percent are working (4.3 percent full-time).

In amendments to the work incentive program for AFDC recipients which were enacted in 1971, the Congress emphasized its concern about the implementation of the program by the Departments of Labor and HEW. However, there has not been a substantial increase in the number of mothers in work and training under WIN. In December 1973, there were 67,357 mothers (or other caretakers) reported as participating in WIN programs.

Table 34, p. 92

Child Care Arrangements Today

Appendix A, p. 151

The most recent detailed information on the care of children while their mothers work is contained in a study entitled "Child Care Arrangements of Working Mothers in the United States," conducted by the Children's Bureau and the Women's Bureau based on 1965 statistics. The study showed that about half of the

8.3 million children of mothers working full time in 1965 were cared for in their own home, usually by a member of their own family or a relative. Ten percent were cared for in the home of a relative, and another 10 percent were cared for in the home of someone who was not a relative. Only 3 percent of the children were cared for in a group care center.

Of the children under six, 47 percent were cared for in their own home, 37 percent were cared for in someone else's home and 8 percent received care in group care centers, with the remainder in other arrangements. Of the school-age children, 50 percent received before-and-after-school care in their own home, 12 percent were cared for in someone else's home, 14 percent looked after themselves, and 16 percent required no child care arrangements because their mothers worked only during school hours.

Why do mothers select one kind of child care arrangement rather than another? In a paper entitled "Realistic Planning for the Day Care Consumer" (The Social Welfare Forum, 1970, pp. 127–142), Arthur C. Emlen suggests that number of children and location are factors as important in determining the type of child care arrangement as is a mother's preference in type of care.

The importance of the number of children in influencing a mother's choice of child care arrangement is shown in the Children's Bureau-Women's Bureau 1965 study: the proportion of children being cared for in their own home was 36 percent when there was only one child under 14 in the family, 46 percent when there were two or three, and 53 percent when there were four or more children. A study by Florence Ruderman (Child Care and Working Mothers, Child Welfare League of America, 1968) showed that one-third of child care center users and 70 percent of family day care users were within 5 minutes of the child care services.

Cost of child care must also be an important factor in determining a mother's choice of arrangement. Of course, these three factors (number of children in the family, proximity of child care services, and cost) are not themselves directly related to the quality of care.

Kinds of care.—Many kinds of child care have been developed to respond to different needs and circumstances. Child care arrangements range from babysitting in the child's own home to full-day center care, with many variations in between. Child care may be under public auspices, or it may be private, either nonprofit or profitmaking. Statistics on kinds of care actually being provided are fragmentary at best, but they appear to indicate that the supply of all kinds of licensed care has been increasing rather rapidly in recent years.

Data collected from the States by the National Center for Social Statistics in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare show that in 1972, the latest year for which there are statistics, there were 81,286 licensed day care centers and family day care homes, with a capacity to care for 1,021,202 children. In 1967, 5 years earlier, the States reported 34,700 licensed centers and homes with a capacity to care for 475,200 children.

Table 21,
p. 58

These figures, however, represent only licensed care. Most care is not provided in licensed facilities, but rather in unlicensed day care homes, in nursery schools, or under informal private arrangements made by individuals.

Care in centers.—The apparent growing demand for and interest in child care actually provided in child care centers has corresponded to an increase in the numbers of centers of all types.

Tables
21, 22,
pp. 58, 60

The reported capacity of licensed child care centers has approximately doubled in the last few years, with both public and private centers, including profitmaking centers, showing increases. Capacity in March 1967 was reported to be 393,300, increasing to 805,361 in 1972.

A large part of the increase has been in voluntary, or private nonprofit, centers. This probably reflects the increasing desire by many private groups and organizations to establish group child care facilities providing child development services. It probably also results from the increased availability and use of Federal social services matching funds under the Social Security Act for purchasing child care services. From 1967 to 1972 the capacity of licensed voluntary facilities grew from 113,900 to 326,431 places for children.

Tables
21, 24,
pp. 58, 64

Independent or proprietary for-profit centers provide about 44 percent of the licensed capacity reported for all centers. In 1972 independent centers had the capacity to provide care to 354,200 children, increased from 239,300 in 1967. These centers may be small one-center enterprises, or may be part of an association composed of more than one center.

There has been a great deal of interest by profitmaking organizations in recent years in the development of child care centers and systems. The fact that the market for services has been considered an expanding one has been one basis for this. Another possible stimulus was the success of nursing home franchising, a concept which many business analysts believed could be applied also in the area of child care. A number of early franchisers may have been overly optimistic, with the result that some plans for child care franchises have been abandoned. Nonetheless, expansion of proprietary child care facilities has continued.

In addition to this kind of for-profit operation, there has been developing interest on the part of some industries and labor unions in providing care for the children of employees. In 1969, an amendment to the Labor-Management Relations Act was adopted permitting employer contributions to joint trust funds for the establishment of child care centers for dependents of employees.

A study issued by the Women's Bureau ("Day Care Services: Industry's Involvement," Bulletin 296, 1971) surveyed the extent to which employers and employee unions have established child care centers for working mothers. As of the date of the study, only a small number of companies and two unions were involved directly and a few others indirectly.

The Women's Bureau survey describes child care centers operated by five textile product manufacturing companies, two food processing companies, and three other companies. The work forces of most of these companies are predominantly female. All of the child care facilities were within, adjacent to, or adjoining the plant facilities of the company. Two were constructed as child care centers, with the rest housed in converted residences, warehouses, or other types of space. The capacity of the centers generally ranged from 40 to 65 children, but most of the centers were not operating at capacity. Three of the centers restricted admission to the children of employees, but the rest accepted other children.

The Women's Bureau survey also describes an early childhood program established under the United Federation of Teachers contract with the New York City Board of Education. The program is designed to provide care and education to the children of teachers returning to teach in poverty area schools and to children of residents in the community. Also described in this publication are child care programs established by the Baltimore and Chicago Joint Boards of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

In another publication ("Child Care Services Provided by Hospitals," Women's Bureau Bulletin 295, 1970) the Women's

Bureau reported that 98 hospitals in 35 States were operating child care facilities for use of their personnel. The centers could accommodate about 3,700 children; almost half enrolled school-age as well as pre-schoolage children. Nearly all the hospitals charged fees for the services, but most subsidized child care center operational costs.

In an article entitled "The Company Cares for Children" (Chapter 14 of *Child Care—Who Cares?* edited by Pamela Roby, Basic Books, 1973), Susan Stein points out that licensed nonprofit industry-sponsored day care currently serves a very small proportion of the day care market. She estimates that some 150 to 200 employer-supported centers have been opened, over half of them in hospitals, health care facilities, and other nonprofit institutions. About 5,000 children under 6 years of age are cared for in these centers. In 1971, the Congress enacted a new provision in the tax law permitting more rapid depreciation of the cost to a business of providing day care facilities and equipment for its employees.

In recent years several child care centers have been established which serve children of employees in various Federal agencies. A child care center in the Department of Labor was designed to serve as a demonstration center which would provide research helpful for replication. It is being subsidized by the Department. The Office of Education also has a child care center originally designed for in-house research, although at the present time funding for the center is scheduled to end in December 1974. The Social and Rehabilitation Service has had a child care center financed through a research and development grant. Last year, however, funding expired and the center now operates as an independent corporation financed basically through parent fees (presently $23 a week per child). Employee organizations have also organized and initiated centers at other Federal agencies, including the Goddard Space Flight Center at Greenbelt, Md., the Department of Agriculture's research center in Beltsville, Md., the National Institute of Health in Bethesda, Md., and the Social Security Administration in Oakland, Calif.

Child care centers have also been established at a large number of universities. The motivation to create them has been varied—some are aimed at serving primarily the needs of students, some are designed also to serve faculty, as well as other personnel, and some exist mainly to serve the needs of departments of education for research and to provide practical experience for students. A survey was made in the spring of 1971 for the Department of Labor which involved a sample of 310 senior, coeducational, accredited colleges and universities in the United States. Among the findings of the study was that at that time about 425 pre-kindergarten programs were in existence: approximately 90 were designated as day care centers, 135 as nursery school programs, 75 as laboratory school programs, and 125 as combination types. The programs enrolled an average of 40 children, with roughly 17,000 children in such programs. About 82 percent of the programs charged fees, with the average fee being $7.55 a week per child ("Children on Campus," Women's Bureau, 1973).

Tables 21, 22, pp. 58, 60

Public providers of center child care have also been expanding their resources. Statistics of the National Center for Social Statistics show an increase in licensed capacity from 22,600 children in 1967 to 79,401 children in 1972. These are centers operated by a unit of State or local government, such as a department of welfare, health, or education. Several States have taken the initiative in developing programs. States reporting the largest capacity in public centers are California, Pennsylvania and Ohio.

Care in day care homes.—Most children who need care are cared for in their own homes by a relative or a friend, and some have no supervision. The next most prevalent kind of care is in day care homes. It is estimated that 55 percent of all children in day care full day are cared for in family day care homes. Information on these homes is limited. Most of them are unlicensed. A day care survey done in 1970 by the Westinghouse Learning Corp. showed that less than 2 percent of an estimated 450,000 day care homes were licensed, as compared to 90 percent of the centers.

Tables 21, 23, pp. 58, 62

Statistics on licensed homes, however limited, do indicate that this is also a rapidly growing area for child care services. Licensed family day care homes had a reported capacity to provide for 81,900 children in 1967, compared with 215,841 children in 1972. Most of these homes are proprietary (i.e. operated for profit); a small number of them are public or voluntary. According to the Westinghouse survey, 75 percent of the family day care homes care for only one or two children on a full-day basis. Some of the money used for paying for child care provided in homes comes from the Federal Government, since a large proportion of the child care purchased under the social services and the work incentive programs is provided in family day care homes.

New York City has had in operation for several years a project designed to recruit family day care mothers and thus expand the supply of homes in which child care is provided. Although the program has had some success, there have been difficulties, including the problem of finding suitable physical facilities and the high costs that have gone along with developing the supportive system, including administration, training, supervision, and special resource personnel. In an article entitled "Day Care: Needs, Costs, Benefits, Alternatives" (U.S. Congress, Joint Economic Committee, Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy, Studies in Public Welfare, Paper No. 7: Issues in the Coordination of Public Welfare Programs, 1973), Vivian Lewis describes the major problems in expanding child care provided in family day care homes. Her observations relate to the difficulty of recruiting and training an adequate supply of day care mothers, resolving problems connected with licensing of homes, and determining how to keep the cost of care within the means of consumers, while providing mothers with adequate compensation.

Other preschool programs.—Part of the problem in trying to determine the existing supply of child care is the lack of uniformity in defining what constitutes child care. Definitions generally exclude nursery schools or similarly designated programs even though they may in fact be providing what might be considered child care under another name. (The definition of day care which is used by the States in reporting licensed facilities would also presumably exclude Headstart programs—see definition at the end of Table 21, p. 59.) In any case, because preschool or nursery school programs and enrollment have been growing at a rapid rate and cover much of the same age population as child care programs, it seems important to examine what has been happening in this area, too.

According to a report on preprimary enrollment for October 1973, published by the Bureau of the Census, the enrollment rate of children 3 to 5 years old in preprimary programs increased from 25.5 percent in 1964 to 40.9 percent in 1973. This represented 4.2 million children enrolled in public or private programs in 1973. These programs are defined as excluding care with no educational component.

The percentage of children enrolled is highest for the 5-year-olds, most of whom are in public kindergartens; the preprimary enrollment rate for this age group was 76.0 percent in 1973,

Tables 25–28, pp. 65–69

compared with 34.2 percent for 4-year-olds and 14.5 percent for 3-year-olds.

Overall, about 6[illegible] percent of the children in preprimary programs were in public programs. This situation varied, however, according to age of children. More than 80 percent of all children enrolled in kindergarten attended public schools; in contrast, about 70 percent of the children in prekindergarten attended nonpublic programs.

Enrollment varied by region. The Bureau of Census statistics show that in the Northeast 74 percent of 5-year-olds were enrolled in preprimary programs, while in the north-central States the proportion was 84.5 percent, in the South 68.0 percent, and in the West 81.1 percent.

In analyzing enrollment in relation to family income, a 1972 Office of Education Report shows a definite correlation between higher income and higher enrollment rates, especially for 3- and 4-year-olds. The report states:

> Little appreciable difference is noted among the enrollment rates of the family income categories falling below $10,000. Enrollment in these categories ranged from a low of 33.4 percent among families earning between $3,000 and $4,999 to a high of 36.3 percent for families earning $7,500 to $9,999 annually. The highest enrollment was found among 3- to 5-year-old children in families earning $10,000 or more a year (50.9 percent). Children in this income group represented about half of all children enrolled in preprimary programs.
>
> For children 5 years old there was little difference in enrollment among the various categories falling below an annual family income of $7,500. Enrollment in these categories averaged 66 percent. In families with an annual income between $7,500 and $9,999, 75.5 percent of the children were enrolled in preprimary programs. At the $10,000 and above income level, 84.1 percent of the 5-year-olds were enrolled in preprimary programs.
>
> Family income appears to be a more crucial factor in the enrollment of children 3 and 4 years old. Among 3-year-olds the percent of children enrolled was nearly twice as high for those in families with an income of $10,000 or more as for those in families earning less than $10,000. There was also a noticeable difference among 4-year-olds when a $10,000 family income is viewed as the dividing point, with a 43.2-percent enrollment rate for the $10,000

and above category, and an average rate of 26.7 percent among children of families with an annual income of less than $10,000. The greater number of tuitioned nonpublic prekindergarten programs in relation to free public prekindergarten programs evidently contributes to the higher enrollment rates for 3-year-olds and 4-year-olds in families earning $10,000 or more. ("Preprimary Enrollment, October 1972," National Center for Educational Statistics, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, p. 6.)

The Bureau of Census report also shows that most of the children enrolled in preprimary programs attend for only part of the day, a factor which would be of concern to mothers working full time. There was, however, a reported increase in the proportion of children attending full-day sessions, from 17.4 percent in 1971 to 22.6 percent in 1973. Full-day attendance was most frequent at the 3-year level, with nearly one-third of the children who were enrolled in preprimary programs attending programs in both the morning and afternoon. At the kindergarten level fewer than one-fifth of the children attended on a full-day basis.

The Education Commission of the States is currently conducting a survey of the States to update a study in 1972 of State activities relating to preprimary education. As of September 1974 the Commission's findings showed 14 States which mandate school districts to offer kindergarten to all who want them. Only three States have no State legislation either mandating or permitting kindergarten. A total of 46 States provide some form of State aid to kindergartens, and 16 provide some form of support for prekindergarten programs.

STATE ACTIVITIES RELATING TO PREPRIMARY EDUCATION (BASED ON SURVEYS BY THE EDUCATION COMMISSION OF THE STATES)[1]

Mandate school districts to offer kindergarten [2]	Have no State legislation permitting or mandating kindergarten	Provide some form of State aid to kindergarten	Provide some form of State aid for prekindergarten programs [3]
Arizona	Mississippi	Alabama	Alaska
California	North Dakota	Alaska	California
Connecticut	Idaho	Arizona	Georgia
Florida		Arkansas	Hawaii
Maine		California	Iowa
Maryland		Colorado	Louisiana
Massachusetts		Connecticut	Maine
Minnesota		Delaware	Massachusetts
Ohio		Florida	Minnesota
Oklahoma		Georgia	Missouri
Rhode Island		Hawaii	New Jersey
Virginia		Illinois	New York
West Virginia		Indiana	Pennsylvania
Wisconsin		Iowa	Rhode Island
		Kansas	Washington
		Kentucky	West Virginia
		Louisiana	
		Maine	
		Maryland	
		Massachusetts	
		Michigan	
		Minnesota	
		Missouri	

Nebraska
Nevada
New Hampshire
New Jersey
New Mexico
New York
North Carolina
Ohio
Oklahoma
Oregon
Pennsylvania
Rhode Island
South Carolina
South Dakota
Tennessee
Texas
Utah
Vermont
Virginia
Washington
West Virginia
Wisconsin
Wyoming

---

[1] State listings were developed from information included in a publication of the Education Commission of the States entitled "Early Childhood Programs: A State Survey," based on a 1972 survey. They have been updated on the basis of 1974 survey information received by the Commission as of September 17, 1974.

[2] Although Colorado does not mandate that kindergarten be offered, schools must offer it in order to be accredited.

[3] Aid for prekindergarten programs is generally very limited, according to the survey. Programs in several States, for example, were reported for handicapped children only. Most programs are pilot programs.

After-school and summer care.—Most children age 6 to 14 who have working mothers are not cared for in any organized way. The Westinghouse survey indicated that less than 3 percent of these children were in some kind of organized before-and/or after-school care. Summer programs for this age group are generally limited to part-day programs which last only part of the summer. For many mothers, it seems to be more difficult to arrange care for their schoolage children than for those who are younger. Often there are fewer facilities available in the community, and transportation problems may be complicated. This probably accounts for the fact that if a school-age child does have care, it is most likely to be some arrangement in his own home or in a neighboring day care home.

Child Care Costs

Ever since proposals have been made for expanding the availability of child care, there has been vigorous debate over the issue of the costs which might be involved. Several attempts were made in the late 1960's and early 1970's to provide measures both of what costs should be, and of what they actually are. The results have been confusing. Figures have ranged from several hundred dollars annually to several thousands. In measuring what the costs should be, there is wide disagreement concerning the standards to be used. But even in measuring the cost of care which is actually being provided there have been basic problems in definitions. A "full day" might be 6 hours in one study, or 10 in another. Services and goods which are volunteered may be given a dollar value in one study, but not counted at all in another. Startup costs may be ignored, or counted in a way which inflates average costs.

Appendix C, p. 177

Studies of costs.—One of the early analyses of costs was developed in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1967, and involved a presentation of child care costs based on three different levels of quality: minimum (defined as "the level essential to maintaining the health and safety of the child, but with relatively little attention to his developmental needs"); acceptable (defined as including "a basic program of developmental activities as well as providing minimum custodial care"); and desirable (defined as including "the full range of general and specialized developmental activities suitable to individualized development").

For full-day care in a child care center, the cost per child in this study is estimated at $1,245 (minimum), $1,862 (acceptable), and $2,320 (desirable). Care in a family day care home, primarily for infants under age 3, is estimated at $1,423 (minimum), $2,032 (acceptable), and $2,372 (desirable). For schoolage children the cost of before and after school and summer care is estimated at $310 (minimum) and $653 (acceptable and desirable). An examination of the budgets on which these figures are based shows that most of the difference is accounted for by amount of staff time, which depends on the number of children per staff member. The analysis points out that costs vary in different areas of the country.

Another study of costs was done by ABT Associates under contract with the Office of Economic Opportunity. This study involved a description and analysis of 20 child care centers and systems that were considered by those writing the study as "among the better centers and systems of their kind in the country."

The report, *A Study in Child Care 1970–71,* indicates an annual cost of $2,349 per child for a center with an average daily attendance of 25 children; $2,223 for a 50-child center; and $2,189 for a 75-child center. It should be noted that these figures are on the basis of average daily attendance (the HEW figures presented above are not). The average cost per enrollee in the ABT study would be somewhat less than the cost figures based on average daily attendance.

The Westinghouse Learning Corporation, also under contract with the Office of Economic Opportunity, made a study in 1970 aimed at describing what actually exists and is being used for full-day care. A survey was made of 289 centers, 577 parent users, and an area probability sample of 134 day care homes and 1,812 families which were potential users of child care. The survey showed a cost of $324 a year for what was defined as custodial care, $540 a year for educational care, and $1,368 for developmental care.

Appendix B, p. 159

In 1972 the Inner City Fund, under contract with the Office of Child Development, prepared a study of costs of child care designed to meet a new set of standards then being considered to replace the 1968 Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements. These standards, which were never promulgated, varied from the earlier standards in the area of child-staff ratio, in general allowing more children per staff members. Excerpts from this study, written by Donald Ogilvie, are in appendix D

Appendix D, p. 185

and include rather detailed analyses involving many variables. Using his data, Vivian Lewis, in the paper referred to earlier which was published by the Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy, calculated that "the mean annual costs of center day care per child (in the 31 largest U.S. cities) dictated by the 1972 standards amount to a substantial \$1,544 for children aged 3 to 4½ years and \$1,311 for children aged 4½ to 6."

The figures cited above do not reflect what parents themselves are actually paying for care of their children, nor what is being paid under existing Federal programs.

Appendices A and B, pp. 151, 159

Statistics on what parents are paying are fragmentary, but do indicate strongly that the amounts are generally considerably less than the estimates given in various studies such as the above. The study done by the Children's Bureau and the Women's Bureau in 1965 showed that 74 percent of all children whose mothers worked full time received free care, usually in their own home by a member of the family or a relative. Only 10 percent of the children were in child care arrangements costing more than \$500 a year. The 1970 Westinghouse survey similarly found that 70 percent of the children received care at little or no cost to the mother, also mostly in their own homes. Only 6 percent of the children were in child care arrangements that cost the parent more than \$650 a year. (These studies do not indicate what part, if any, of the cost of care might be paid for by another source of funding, such as under a Federal program.)

Tables 30, 31, pp. 78, 80

The reported cost of care provided under Federal programs appears to vary widely, both according to the program under which it is provided and according to the State in which it is delivered. The average annual cost per child of care provided under the AFDC social services program, including both Federal and State costs, was \$1,177 in 1974 on a nationwide basis. However, according to estimates developed in a special HEW survey in 1973, the Federal amounts ranged from about \$240 per child in Wyoming to slightly more than \$3,000 in Pennsylvania. In these cases the quality and amount of care provided must have been very different. The costs of full-year, full-day Head Start programs also show great variations. In 1973 the national average Federal per-child cost was \$1,041. Statistics from the Office of Child Development show amounts of \$69 in Vermont, \$180 in Colorado, \$381 in Utah—compared with \$2,222 in New York, \$2,104 in California, and \$1,994 in the District of Columbia.

Table 38, p. 98

Under the work incentive program, in which most mothers evidently have to look for their own child care and then seek reimbursement, the average cost nationwide in 1974 was $664 ($597 Federal, $67 State). *Table 30, p. 78*

One factor which may lead to an increase in child care costs is the recent coverage of child care workers under minimum wage legislation, and the recently enacted increase in the amount of the minimum wage. Most studies indicate that personnel costs account for at least 70 to 80 percent of total costs. Thus the most important ingredients in determining the cost of a program are the level of wages and the number of staff members required for a given number of children.

The issue of fee schedules.—The argument over whether Federal child care programs should require parents who are able to contribute to the cost of care to do so has been a continuing one. However, the idea of a fee schedule has gradually become more widely acceptable, and provision for a schedule has been included in a number of legislative proposals involving an expansion of child care services. Nevertheless, the development of an acceptable fee schedule is far from simple, as evidenced by the recent experience in attempting to implement a schedule under the Headstart program. In this case it was charged that the proposed fee schedule was too high to be realistic, that it would cost more to administer than would be gained, and that it was basically impossible to administer fairly. Whatever the merits of the arguments, they were forceful enough to block implementation of the schedule, at least for the present.

A provision in title IV of the Social Security Act requires the States to provide in their State plans "in cases in which the family is able to pay part or all of the costs of such child care, for payment of such fees as may be reasonable in the light of such ability." A recent survey of State practices with respect to fee schedules by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare indicates that fee schedules have not been developed in all States and that there is wide variation among those States which do have fee schedules in the extent and manner of applying them.

Excerpts from a report on fee schedules done by ABT Associates in 1972 for the Office of Child Development are included in appendix E. The report describes the elements involved in the development of a fee schedule for child care. *Appendix E, p. 209*

Federal Involvement in Child Care

Background.—So far as current Federal programs to assist child care are concerned, the major source of operational funds continues to be programs financed under the Social Security Act. In 1962, amendments to the Act authorized Federal funds to be matched by the States in providing day care services. In 1968 and 1971 there were additional amendments designed to increase the amount of Federal funding for child care under the Social Security Act, and to promote the expansion of child care services.

In recent years there has been other legislation relating to child care, including the authorization of Head Start under the Economic Opportunity Act, training for child care and child care services under various education and manpower laws, child care provided in connection with housing and urban development programs, and a number of additional pieces of legislation.

Table 29, p. 70

Estimates of the total amount of money being spent for child care vary because expenditure data for some programs are incomplete or do not exist. However, a general estimate of the amount of money being spent directly by the Federal government for child care, broadly defined, would be approximately $1.2 billion in 1974. Indirect funding is provided through provisions in Federal law for income tax deductions by individuals and businesses for child care costs. The major Federal programs providing support for child care, and the amounts of money involved, are outlined below.

Tables 24, 30, 31, pp. 64, 78, 80

Social services (title IV, part A, of the Social Security Act).—Legislation in 1962 increased Federal matching to the States from 50 to 75 percent for social services, including child care, provided to actual, former, and potential recipients of Aid to Families with Dependent Children. The Social Security Amendments of 1967 broadened the conditions under which this authority could be used to purchase child care services from sources other than the welfare agency itself. Use by the States of this provision has been uneven. In the period 1970–1972, however, the demand by some States for Federal matching funds for these purposes began to grow very rapidly, and Congress in 1972 placed a $2.5 billion annual limit on Federal expenditures for all social services, with funds allocated among the States on the basis of population. For fiscal year 1974, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates that the States received $164 million, or somewhat more than one-fourth of the total social services money received, for child care purposes. An estimated 525,821 average number of children were being served, at an average annual Federal cost of $883 per child. This compares with a Federal share in 1970 of $68 million for 83,327 children at a cost of $820 per child, and in 1973 a Federal expenditure of $371 million for 456,880 children at a cost of $813 per child.

Table 30, p. 78

Although ordinarily care is provided free to the child under this program, States do have the authority to impose fee schedules.

The kind of care varies widely among the States, and even within a State. Depending on circumstances, a child may be receiving what are generally considered child development services in a center, or the child may be in a family day care home. The care may be provided directly by the welfare agency, but more often is purchased from another provider of care or provided under contract with another agency. Like all care provided with Federal funds under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, this care is supposed to meet the 1968 Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements. Testimony has indicated, however, that there is little monitoring to see whether the requirements have in fact been met.

Appendix I, p. 249

Child care as a work expense (title IV, part A, of the Social Security Act).—Under the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program, States must deduct the cost of child care as a work expense in determining income for welfare purposes. Thus if a mother must purchase child care in order to take employment, the amount she pays is deducted from her income in determining whether she is eligible for some amount of welfare supplementation. For example, a mother may earn $300 a month, but pay $100 for child care. For welfare eligibility and payment purposes, she would be considered to have an income of $200; if her State's standard of need exceeded $200, she would be eligible for at least a partial subsidy of the cost of the child care.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates that in fiscal year 1974, 200,000 child care years were funded through this work expense provision. The cost to the Federal government was $85 million, or $425 per child care year. This compares with an estimated 1970 Federal cost of $57 million and $189 per child (for 302,645 child care years),

Table 30, p. 78

and a 1973 cost of $81 million and $405 per child (for 200,000 child care years).

Tables 32–36, pp. 84–96

Work incentive program (title IV, part C, of the Social Security Act).—The Social Security Act requires AFDC mothers with no children below age 6 to register for manpower services, training and employment under the Work Incentive (WIN) program. Mothers with younger children may volunteer for these services. These WIN manpower programs are administered by the Department of Labor. The States are required to provide child care services to all enrollees who need such services, and are entitled to receive 90 percent Federal matching funds for WIN child care services. Under WIN regulations, the full cost of child care is covered for the period of enrollment, including the 90 days of "follow-up" after the mother is employed. After that time, the mother may be eligible for child care services under other provisions of the Social Security Act.

Table 29, p. 70

Despite major amendments to the Work Incentive program enacted by the Congress in December 1971, child care services under the program have not undergone major expansion. Federal expenditures for WIN child care were $45 million in 1973, and an estimated $47 million in 1974. The actual number of child care years to be provided showed a decline from 80,100 child care years in 1973 to 75,350 child care years in 1974. The Budget estimate submitted for 1975 provides for the same number of child care years as in 1974.

About three-fourths of the child care being provided under the WIN program is not provided in a child care facility, but in the child's own home, the home of a relative, or some other similar arrangement. In addition, considerably more than half of the children being cared for are age 6 or above, and thus in need of care for only part of the day. These factors explain, perhaps, why the average cost of care for a child under the WIN program has remained relatively low. The average Federal cost was $562 per child in 1973 ($624 total cost, including the non-Federal share), and is estimated at $597 ($664 total cost) in 1974.

Table 30, p. 78

Table 37, p. 97

Child welfare services (title IV, part B, of the Social Security Act).—Although the Child Welfare Services authorization is for $226 million in 1975, the budget request is for $46 million, an amount equal to the level of spending under the program in recent years. These Federal matching funds are allotted among the States on the basis of the child population, and may be used by the States for a variety of child welfare services (including child care) for all children in the State, regardless of income. Most of the Federal money is used for foster care. However, a small amount, estimated at $1.8 million in 1974, was reportedly used by the States for the provision of child care services.

Headstart.—There has been a trend in recent years toward more full-year, full-day Headstart programs which can serve the needs of working mothers as well as the needs of children. In fiscal year 1973 there were 118,347 children in full-year, full-day Headstart programs, at a Federal cost of $123.2 million. The average Federal cost per child was $1,041, although per child costs varied widely among the States.

Table 38, p. 98

Headstart, originally administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity, is now under the Office of Child Development in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Federal funding is provided for up to 80 percent of the cost of Headstart programs. Grants may be made to local community action agencies, which administer the majority of Headstart programs, or to other public or nonprofit agencies. Federal law requires that 10 percent of the children being served by Headstart be children with handicaps. Ninety percent of the enrollees must be from poor families.

A fee schedule for Headstart enrollees was adopted in 1973, but public opposition to it was such that a law suspending its use was enacted in December 1973.

Training of Personnel.—Although no one Federal program has placed primary emphasis on training personnel for child care, a number of Federal programs have provided some support for this kind of training.

The Social Security Act (Section 426) authorizes grants to institutions of higher learning to train people to work in the field of child welfare, including child care. The funds may be used for teaching grants, traineeships, or short-term training activities.

About 900 kindergarten teacher aides were trained in fiscal year 1974 under the Office of Education's Follow Through program.

The Labor Department's manpower programs have offered training in several occupational areas related to child care services. Such training has been possible under the Work Incentive program and programs authorized under the Manpower Development and Training Act. Under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act enacted by the 93d Congress these latter programs will generally be replaced by block grants to States and localities. The kinds of training which will be provided will be determined at the State and local levels. Although it is still too early to know how the Federal manpower funds will be spent, they could be used for training of child care personnel if a State or locality elected to do so.

The Office of Child Development is currently funding a new kind of training program. The program is aimed at developing a new level of child care personnel, called the Child Development Associate. In 1973 OCD gave grants to thirteen pilot projects operated by educational institutions and other organizations which had developed programs emphasizing experience, rather than academic training of enrollees. It is hoped that the program will result in a system of credentialing for graduates of this type of child care training.

The Headstart program under the Office of Child Development also provides for training of child care personnel. In fiscal year 1974, 5,000 Headstart employees received supplementary training in the form of college level child development courses. Another 5,000 were enrolled in the above-mentioned Child Development Associate program; 1,000 were in leadership development programs of intensive child development skill training; and 85,000 participated in short orientation and inservice training programs.

The Social and Rehabilitation Service recently announced that it had awarded a $181,000 first year grant to West Virginia to help finance a $1.2 million home-based day care demonstration project. The expressed aim of the program is to train welfare mothers to operate day care facilities for children so that other welfare mothers can take jobs. The first year's grant will go for the training of mothers as "Child Care Advisors" and providers, and for especially developed training materials for them.

Under the Education Professions Development Act, the Office of Education has been providing support for projects to train and retrain persons to work in educational programs for children. In 1972, 4,289 persons received training in early childhood. However, this program has essentially been phased out.

Table 23, p. 70

Other Federal programs relating to child care.—There is a wide range of additional Federal legislation and of Federal programs which relate to child care services, training and facilities. The table presented on page 70 lists most of these and indicates the amount of Federal expenditure. Following is a brief description of some of these programs. (A more detailed listing and description is presented in a publication of the Women's Bureau in the Department of Labor, entitled "Federal Funds for Day Care Projects," pamphlet 14, 1972.)

The Office of Education may make grants to local education agencies under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for child care or preschool programs designed to meet the special needs of educationally-deprived children living in areas with high concentrations of children from low income families. Grants may also be made to State agencies for special assistance to children who are handicapped, neglected, delinquent, and children of migrants.

Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act authorizes funds for special programs, projects and services looking toward the solution of particular educational problems. A number of programs are aimed at preschool children.

In the area of health programs, the Migrant Health Act of 1962 authorizes health services for migrant children in child care centers; the Indian Sanitation Facilities Act authorizes funds for services related to child care; and the National Institute of Child Health and Development has authority to conduct research in the area of child care and child mental health.

Of growing importance to child care programs is the assistance available under various food and nutrition programs. Preschool programs which are part of the school system are eligible for assistance under the school lunch program. There is a Special Food Service Program which provides grants in aid to States to operate non-profit food service programs in institutions for children, including child care and Headstart centers. The money available for centers under this program is estimated in the President's budget to increase from about $18 million in 1973 to $59 million in 1975. Preschool programs have also been served by the special milk and commodity distribution programs.

Table 39, p. 100

The Department of Interior operates Indian child welfare and education programs aimed at serving preschool children.

Child care services have been provided when necessary as supportive services under various programs administered by the Department of Labor. Although these programs are being replaced under the recently enacted Comprehensive Employment and Development Act, the States and localities which receive funds under the new legislation may elect to use them for child care services.

Model Cities and Neighborhood Facilities programs have provided funds for child care. These programs are being replaced under the new Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-383). Title I of this act (Community Development) provides for Federal funding of public services, specifically including child care, in community development programs.

Profit-making child care centers are able to qualify for loans under the Small Business Act; and public or private nonprofit agencies in certain child development demonstration areas may qualify for grants for child care programs under the Appalachian Regional Commission.

Various research and demonstration projects are also authorized under Federal legislation, in addition to the abovementioned authorization for projects under the National Institute of Child Health and Development. Section 426 of the Social Security Act authorizes grants to public or other nonprofit agencies and organizations engaged in research in child welfare activities, including child care. These are administered by the Office of Child Development. The Office of Education also makes grants to private and public agencies for research and demonstration projects relating to early childhood education.

Tables 40, 41, pp. 102, 103

Tax provisions relating to child care.—Amendments to the Internal Revenue Code in the 92nd Congress provided for a major change in law relating to personal income tax deductions allowable for child care services. The Revenue Act of 1971 provided a special income tax deduction for single individuals and working couples who support a child under the age of 15. The deduction is for domestic help expenses and child care expenses incurred in order to permit the taxpayer to be gainfully employed. A deduction is permitted of up to $400 a month for child care and domestic help expenses if these expenses are incurred in the home. For child care provided outside the home, deductions are allowable up to $200 a month for one child, $300 for two children, and $400 for three or more children. The deduction is fully available to married couples who are both employed and whose combined income does not exceed $18,000 a year, and to employed individuals whose income does not exceed $18,000 a year. The allowable deduction is reduced by 50 cents for each dollar of income above $18,000. For 1972 the amount of tax deduction which is claimed under this provision totaled $1 billion; it is estimated that this resulted in a reduced liability for Federal income taxes amounting to $224 million. Under an earlier, much more limited provision, the annual reduction in tax liability attributable to the deduction of child and dependent care expenses had totalled $25 million to $30 million annually since 1967.

There are also tax provisions relating to child care programs operated by businesses. Businesses may claim as tax deductions expenses considered to be "ordinary and necessary," which may include amounts paid or accrued by a business for recreational, welfare, or similar benefits, designed to attract employees and promote greater efficiency among their employees. An amendment to the Internal Revenue Act in 1971 allows businesses a more rapid writeoff (amortization over a period of 60 months) of capital expenditures for acquiring, constructing, reconstructing or rehabilitating child care facilities. The effect of this provision is not known exactly, but is estimated to be quite small.

Standards and Licensing

Prior to 1968 there were no Federal standards for child care services provided under Federal legislation. The Children's Bureau did include among its activities, however, efforts to promote State and local licensing of day care facilities. The Public Welfare Amendments of 1962, in amending the Social Security Act to make specific provision for Federal funds for day care, required that funds be used for care in facilities licensed or approved by the State.

Federal interagency day care requirements.—In 1967, however, a provision was included in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1967 which stated:

> The Director [of the Office of Economic Opportunity] and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall take all necessary steps to coordinate programs under their jurisdictions which provide day care, with a view to establishing, insofar as possible, a common set of program standards and regulations, and mechanisms for coordination at the State and local levels.

This legislation resulted in the creation in the spring of 1968 of a Federal Panel on Early Childhood, which developed and promulgated the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements of 1968, which were to be effective for all programs administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Department

Appendix I, p. 249

of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Department of Labor.

The Economic Opportunity Amendments in 1972 added to this provision the following requirement:

> Such standards shall be no less comprehensive than the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements as approved by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the Department of Labor on September 23, 1968.

An effort has been made by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to develop and issue a new set of Federal requirements. Modified requirements were actually used in the cost study prepared by Donald Ogilvie for the Inner City Fund in 1972. However, because of disagreements over their content, they have never been issued.

The regulations which HEW proposed to become effective in 1973 for social services programs would have provided for new standards to be issued by the Secretary of HEW for child care under the Social Security Act. Public Law 93–233, however, delayed the implementation of these social services regulations until January 1975.

Thus the 1968 requirements technically remain in effect for nearly all child care provided under Federal funds, although it is generally acknowledged that they are rarely monitored.

Tables 42–46, pp. 104–147

Licensing.—The role of the Federal government in the licensing area has generally been advisory, with some matching funds made available to the States for licensing functions. States have been able to receive Federal financial assistance for this purpose under Title IV of the Social Security Act. Although nearly everyone would agree that licensing requirements are necessary, there has been some concern about the nature and effect of various State licensing requirements. The Auerbach Corporation issued a report on the Work Incentive program in 1970 in which it stated that "the greatest stated problem [concerning physical facilities for child care] is in meeting the various local ordinances which, according to some staffs, are prohibitive. Some examples are: windows no more than "x" feet from the floor, sanitation facilities for children, appropriately scaled, sprinkler systems, fireproof construction, etc."

In a report called "Day Care Centers—The Case for Prompt Expansion," which indicated why day care facilities and programs in New York City had lagged behind the demand, it was stated:

> The City's Health Code governs all aspects of day care center operations and activities. Few sections of the Code are more detailed and complex than those which set forth standards for day care centers. The

applicable sections are extremely detailed, contain over 7,000 words of text and an equal volume of footnotes, and stretch over two articles and twenty printed pages.

The provisions of the City's Health Code that apply to day care center facilities constitute the greatest single obstacle to development of new day care center facilities. The highly detailed, and sometimes very difficult-to-meet, specifications for day care facilities inhibit the development of new facilities. Obviously there must be certain minimum fire, health, and safety standards for the protection of children in day care centers. The provisions of the Health Code go far beyond this point. Indeed, some sections of the Code are a welter of complex detail that encourages inflexibility in interpretation and discourages compliance.

Legally, only those centers that conform to the Health Code may be licensed. Faced with Health Code requirements of such detail, personnel of the Divisions concerned in the Department of Health and in the Department of Social Services have had to choose between considering the regulations as prerequisites to the licensing of new day care centers or merely as goals toward which to work.

In general, the choice is made in favor of strict interpretation notwithstanding the fact that this severely handicaps the efforts of groups attempting to form centers in substandard areas.

Concern with these kinds of problems, and also for the inadequacy of requirements in some States, led to the undertaking in 1970 by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Office of Economic Opportunity of a project to develop model day care licensing and regulatory material for use by the States in developing licensing statutes and regulatory codes. The process and the results were controversial, but HEW did publish in 1973 new "Guides for Day Care Licensing." The guides have been criticized as advocating an inadequate level of care and as being too detailed; they have been praised as providing usable guides and adequate and reasonable standards which the States can adapt to their own conditions.

A detailed and up-to-date summary of State licensing requirements and of the HEW "Guides" is provided in tables 42–46. Requirements relate both to staffing and to physical facilities.

Tables 42–46, pp. 104–147

The Office of Child Development has recently provided small grants to the States to assist them in reviewing and revising their licensing requirements.

The National Council of Organizations for Children and Youth, an organization of a number of groups interested in child care, has also issued its own draft model code.

TABLES

TABLE 1.—NUMBER OF CHILDREN UNDER 18 YEARS OLD, BY AGE, TYPE OF FAMILY, LABOR FORCE STATUS OF MOTHER, AND RACE, MARCH 1970 AND MARCH 1973

[Numbers in thousands]

Type of family, labor force status of mother, and race	Age of children, 1970			Age of children, 1973		
	Under 18 years	Under 6 years	6 to 17 years	Under 18 years	Under 6 years	6 to 17 years
Total children [1]	65,755	19,606	46,149	64,303	19,145	45,158
Mother in labor force	25,544	5,590	19,954	26,189	5,952	20,237
Husband-wife family	58,399	17,920	40,479	55,238	16,905	38,333
Mother in labor force	21,982	4,947	17,035	21,871	5,097	16,774
Mother not in labor force	36,417	12,973	23,444	33,367	11,808	21,559
Female family head [2]	6,695	1,593	5,102	8,344	2,149	6,195
Mother in labor force	3,562	643	2,919	4,318	855	3,463
Mother not in labor force	3,133	950	2,183	4,026	1,294	2,732
Other male family head [2]	661	93	568	721	91	630
White children, total	56,903	16,940	39,963	55,221	16,416	38,805
Mother in labor force	21,194	4,459	16,735	21,812	4,803	17,009
Husband-wife family	52,336	15,975	36,361	49,710	15,211	34,499

00048

Mother in labor force	18,865	4,083	14,782	18,900	4,263	14,637
Mother not in labor force	33,471	11,892	21,579	30,810	10,948	19,862
Female family head [2]	4,102	908	3,194	4,963	1,149	3,814
Mother in labor force	2,329	376	1,953	2,912	540	2,372
Mother not in labor force	1,773	532	1,241	2,051	609	1,442
Other male family head [2]	465	57	408	548	56	492
Negro children, total	8,054	2,381	5,673	8,146	2,400	5,746
Mother in labor force	4,015	1,031	2,984	3,984	1,031	2,953
Husband-wife family	5,535	1,683	3,652	4,802	1,419	3,383
Mother in labor force	2,810	775	2,035	2,624	725	1,899
Mother not in labor force	2,525	908	1,617	2,178	694	1,484
Female family head [2]	2,529	663	1,866	3,180	950	2,230
Mother in labor force	1,205	256	949	1,360	306	1,054
Mother not in labor force	1,324	407	917	1,820	644	1,176
Other male family head [2]	190	35	155	164	31	133

---

[1] Children are defined as "own" children of the family head and include never-married sons and daughters, stepchildren, and adopted children. Excluded are other related children such as grandchildren, nieces, nephews, and cousins, and unrelated children.

[2] Widowed, divorced, separated, and single family heads.

Source: Department of Labor.

TABLE 2.—NUMBER OF CHILDREN WITH MOTHERS IN THE LABOR FORCE, BY AGE, 1965–73

[In millions]

	1965	1970	1973
Total, all children under age 18	17.3	25.5	26.2
Under age 6	4.5	5.6	6.0
Age 6 to 17	12.8	19.9	20.2

Source: Derived from statistics published by the Department of Labor.

TABLE 3.—CHILDREN UNDER AGE 6 WITH MOTHERS IN THE LABOR FORCE, 1970–1973

	1970	1972	1973
Total children under age 6	19,606,000	19,235,000	19,145,000
With mother in labor force	5,590,000	5,607,000	5,952,000
Percent of children under age 6 with mother in the labor force	28.5	29.1	31.1

Source: Derived from statistics published by the Department of Labor.

TABLE 4.—LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATES OF MOTHERS, SELECTED YEARS[1]

[In percent]

	All mothers	Mothers with children under 6 years	Mothers with children 6 to 17 years only
Percentage of mothers participating in the labor force:			
1950	22	14	33
1960	30	20	43
1964	34	25	46
1967	38	29	49
1970	42	32	52
1973	44	34	53

[1] Data apply only to ever-married women.

Source: Department of Labor.

TABLE 5.—LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATES [1] OF MARRIED WOMEN, HUSBAND PRESENT, BY PRESENCE AND AGE OF CHILDREN, MARCH 1960 TO 1973

Year	All wives	No children under 18 years	With children under 18 years				
					Under 6 years		
			Total	6 to 17 years only	Total	3 to 5 years, none under 3 years	Under 3 years
1960	30.5	34.7	27.6	39.0	18.6	25.1	15.3
1961	32.7	37.3	29.6	41.7	20.0	25.5	17.0
1962	32.7	36.1	30.3	41.8	21.3	27.2	18.2
1963	33.7	37.4	31.2	41.5	22.5	28.5	19.4
1964	34.4	37.8	32.0	43.0	22.7	26.7	20.5
1965	34.7	38.3	32.2	42.7	23.3	29.2	20.0
1966	35.4	38.4	33.2	43.7	24.2	29.1	21.2
1967	36.8	38.9	35.3	45.0	26.5	31.7	23.3
1968	38.3	40.1	36.9	46.9	27.6	34.0	23.4
1969	39.6	41.0	38.6	48.6	28.5	34.7	24.2
1970	40.8	42.2	39.7	49.2	30.3	37.0	25.8
1971	40.8	42.1	39.7	49.4	29.6	36.1	25.7
1972	41.5	42.7	40.5	50.2	30.1	36.1	26.9
1973	42.2	42.8	41.7	50.1	32.7	38.3	29.4

[1] Labor force as percent of population.

Source: Department of Labor.

TABLE 6.—NUMBER OF MOTHERS[1] PARTICIPATING IN THE LABOR FORCE, BY AGE OF CHILDREN, 1966–1973

[In millions]

	1966	1969	1971	1972	1973
Mothers in the labor force with children under 18	9.9	11.6	12.2	12.7	13.0
Mothers in the labor force with children under 6	3.8	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.8

[1] Includes only mothers who have ever been married.

Source: Derived from statistics published by the Department of Labor.

TABLE 7.—MOTHERS IN THE LABOR FORCE, BY MARITAL STATUS AND AGE OF CHILDREN, MARCH 1972 AND 1973[1]

[Mothers 16 years of age and over]

Marital status and age of children	Number		Percent distribution		As percent of women in population	
	1973	1972	1973	1972	1973	1972
Mothers with children under 18 years	13,017,000	12,682,000	100.0	100.0	44.1	42.9
Married, husband present	10,714,000	10,452,000	82.3	82.4	41.7	40.5
Widowed, divorced, or separated	2,303,000	2,230,000	17.7	17.6	59.7	59.1
Mothers with children 6 to 17 years only	8,253,000	8,244,000	63.4	65.0	52.8	52.6
Married, husband present	6,658,000	6,706,000	51.1	52.9	50.1	50.2
Widowed, divorced, or separated	1,595,000	1,538,000	12.3	12.1	68.3	66.5

Mothers with children under 6 years [2]	4,764,000	4,438,000	36.6	35.0	34.2	31.9
Married, husband present	4,056,000	3,746,000	31.2	29.5	32.7	30.1
Widowed, divorced, or separated	708,000	692,000	5.4	5.5	46.6	47.4
Mothers with children 3 to 5 years (none under 3) [2]	2,192,000	1,950,000	16.8	15.4	40.6	38.7
Married, husband present	1,779,000	1,580,000	13.7	12.5	38.3	36.1
Widowed, divorced, or separated	413,000	370,000	3.2	2.9	54.8	55.8
Mothers with children under 3 years [2]	2,572,000	2,488,000	19.8	19.6	30.2	28.1
Married, husband present	2,277,000	2,166,000	17.5	17.1	29.4	26.9
Widowed, divorced, or separated	295,000	322,000	2.3	2.5	38.5	40.4

---

[1] Includes only mothers who have ever been married.
[2] May also have older children.

Source: Department of Labor.

TABLE 8.—LABOR FORCE STATUS OF WOMEN WHO HAVE EVER BEEN MARRIED BY PRESENCE AND AGE OF CHILDREN, MARCH 1973

[Women 16 years of age and over]

Race and presence and age of children	Population	Labor force	
		Number	As percent of women in population
WOMEN OF ALL RACES			
Total	62,971,000	26,165,000	41.6
Mothers with children under 18 years	29,533,000	13,017,000	44.1
With children 6 to 17 years only	15,619,000	8,253,000	52.8
With children under 6 years [1]	13,914,000	4,764,000	34.2
With no children under 3 years [1]	5,401,000	2,192,000	40.6
With children under 3 years [1]	8,513,000	2,572,000	30.2
Women without children under 18 years	33,438,000	13,148,000	39.3
WOMEN OF MINORITY RACES			
Total	6,807,000	3,374,000	49.6
Mothers with children under 18 years	3,481,000	1,915,000	55.0
With children 6 to 17 years only	1,748,000	1,073,000	61.4
With children under 6 years [1]	1,733,000	842,000	48.6
Women without children under 18 years	3,326,000	1,459,000	43.9

[1] May also have older children.

Source: Department of Labor.

TABLE 9.—FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN: HUSBAND-WIFE FAMILIES AND FEMALE-HEADED FAMILIES: 1960–73[1]

	1960	1965	1970	1972	1973
Husband-wife families	23,333,000	24,346,000	25,547,000	25,482,000	25,395,000
Female-headed families	2,097,000	2,479,000	2,924,000	3,598,000	3,796,000

[1] Data for 1970, 1972, and 1973 are not strictly comparable with data for 1960 and 1965 because of the introduction of 1970 Census data. Families covered by the table are only those which include 1 or more of the parent's own children.

Source: Based on data published by the Department of Labor.

TABLE 10.—NUMBER OF FAMILIES AND AVERAGE NUMBER OF OWN CHILDREN UNDER 18 YEARS OLD, BY TYPE OF FAMILY, LABOR FORCE STATUS OF MOTHER, AND RACE, MARCH 1970 AND MARCH 1973

Type of family, labor force status of mother, and race	March 1970		March 1973		Percentage change 1970–73 in number of families
	Number of families with children under 18 years old (thousands)	Average number of children per family [1]	Number of families with children under 18 years old (thousands)	Average number of children per family [1]	
ALL FAMILIES					
Husband-wife families	25,547	2.29	25,395	2.18	−0.6
Mother in labor force	10,210	2.15	10,592	2.06	+3.7
Mother not in labor force	15,337	2.37	14,803	2.25	−3.5
Female family head	2,924	2.29	3,796	2.20	+29.8
Mother in labor force	1,731	2.06	2,225	1.94	+28.5
Mother not in labor force	1,193	2.63	1,571	2.56	+31.7

WHITE					
Husband-wife families	23,285	2.25	23,186	2.14	−0.4
Mother in labor force	8,970	2.10	9,330	2.03	+4.0
Mother not in labor force	14,315	2.34	13,856	2.22	−3.2
Female family head	1,994	2.05	2,465	2.01	+23.6
Mother in labor force	1,237	1.88	1,571	1.85	+27.0
Mother not in labor force	757	2.34	894	2.29	+18.1
NEGRO					
Husband-wife families	2,001	2.67	1,909	2.52	−4.6
Mother in labor force	1,120	2.51	1,109	2.37	−1.0
Mother not in labor force	881	2.87	800	2.72	−9.1
Female family head	912	2.77	1,258	2.53	+37.9
Mother in labor force	485	2.48	633	2.15	+30.5
Mother not in labor force	427	3.10	625	2.91	+46.4

---

[1] Children are defined as "own" children of the family head and include never married sons and daughters, stepchildren, and adopted children. Excluded are other related children such as grandchildren, nieces, nephews, and cousins, and unrelated children.

Source: Department of Labor.

00059

TABLE 11.—WORK EXPERIENCE IN 1972[1] OF MARRIED WOMEN, HUSBAND PRESENT, BY PRESENCE AND AGE OF CHILDREN, AND RACE, MARCH 1973

Presence and age of children and race	With work experience		Percent distribution of wives with work experience							
				Worked at full-time jobs[2]				Worked at part-time jobs[3]		
	Number (thousands)	Percent of civilian noninstitutional population	Total	Total	50 to 52 weeks	27 to 49 weeks	1 to 26 weeks	Total	27 weeks or more	1 to 26 weeks
ALL WIVES										
Total	23,255	50.5	100	70.0	43.2	12.9	14.0	30.0	18.0	12.0
With children under 18 years	12,837	51.2	100	64.7	35.0	13.0	16.7	35.3	20.4	14.8
Under 6 years	5,346	44.6	100	65.5	26.1	14.6	24.8	34.5	16.1	18.4
3 to 5 years, none under 3	2,126	47.0	100	63.3	34.9	10.3	18.2	36.7	20.8	15.9
Under 3 years	3,220	43.2	100	67.0	20.4	17.5	29.2	33.0	13.0	20.1
6 to 17 years only	7,491	57.3	100	64.2	41.3	11.9	11.0	35.8	23.6	12.3
No children under 18 years	10,418	49.5	100	76.6	53.3	12.8	10.5	23.4	14.9	8.5
WHITE										
Total	21,016	49.6	100	69.1	42.2	12.9	14.0	30.9	18.4	12.4
With children under 18 years	11,432	50.1	100	62.9	33.2	12.7	17.0	37.1	21.5	15.6
Under 6 years	4,656	42.9	100	63.3	23.9	14.0	25.3	36.7	17.2	19.6
3 to 5 years, none under 3	1,861	45.1	100	60.7	32.5	9.8	18.4	39.3	21.9	17.4
Under 3 years	2,795	41.6	100	64.9	18.2	16.7	30.0	35.1	14.0	21.1
6 to 17 years only	6,776	56.5	100	62.7	39.6	11.9	11.2	37.3	24.4	12.9
No children under 18 years	9,584	49.1	100	76.5	53.0	13.0	10.4	23.5	14.8	8.6
NEGRO										
Total	1,994	61.1	100	78.3	51.9	12.6	13.9	21.7	13.8	7.8
With children under 18 years	1,254	65.2	100	79.1	49.0	14.8	15.4	20.9	12.1	8.8
Under 6 years	617	63.0	100	80.6	40.7	18.6	21.2	19.4	8.6	10.9
3 to 5 years, none under 3	244	68.0	100	82.4	51.6	13.9	16.8	17.6	12.3	5.3
Under 3 years	373	60.1	100	79.4	33.5	21.7	24.1	20.6	6.2	14.5
6 to 17 years only	637	67.6	100	77.7	57.0	11.0	9.7	22.3	15.5	6.8
No children under 18 years	740	55.1	100	77.0	56.8	8.9	11.4	23.0	16.8	6.2

---

[1] Worked at some time during the year.

[2] Worked 35 hours or more a week during a majority of the weeks worked.

[3] Worked less than 35 hours a week during a majority of the weeks worked.

Source: Department of Labor.

TABLE 12.—NUMBER OF MARRIED WOMEN WITH MINOR CHILDREN IN THE POPULATION AND IN THE LABOR FORCE, BY YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED, MARCH 1972

	With children under 6 years	With children 6 to 17 years only
Women in the labor force:		
Less than 4 years of high school..	853,000	1,918,000
4 years of high school............	1,930,000	3,444,000
1 to 3 years of college............	533,000	705,000
4 years or more of college........	430,000	639,000
Total............................	3,746,000	6,706,000
Percent of women participating in the labor force:		
Less than 4 years of high school..	26	45
4 years of high school............	31	52
1 to 3 years of college............	32	49
4 years or more of college........	34	60
All women participating in the labor force......................	30	50

Source: Department of Labor.

TABLE 13.—LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATES AND PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF MOTHERS (HUSBAND PRESENT), BY INCOME OF HUSBAND IN 1972 AND AGES OF CHILDREN, MARCH 1973

[Mothers 16 years of age and over]

Income of husband	Labor force participation rates of mothers with children			Percent distribution of mothers in the labor force with children		
	Under 18 years	6 tc 17 years only	Under 6 years[1]	Under 18 years	6 to 17 years only	Under 6 years[1]
Number				10,714,000	6,658,000	4,056,000
Percent	41.7	50.1	32.7	100.0	100.0	100.0
Under $3,000	48.0	50.9	44.6	6.0	5.4	6.9
$3,000 to $4,999	44.4	55.4	35.7	7.6	6.7	9.2
$5,000 to $6,999	46.0	57.1	38.6	13.0	10.4	17.2
$7,000 to $9,999	46.6	56.8	37.8	25.7	23.5	29.3
$10,000 and over	37.7	46.1	26.3	47.7	53.9	37.4

[1] May also have older children.

Source: Department of Labor.

TABLE 14.—NUMBER OF CHILDREN UNDER 18 YEARS OLD, MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME IN 1972, TYPE OF FAMILY, LABOR FORCE STATUS OF PARENTS, AND RACE, MARCH 1973

[Numbers in thousands]

Type of family and labor force status of parents, as of March 1973	All children		White		Negro	
	Number	Median family income in 1972	Number	Median family income in 1972	Number	Median family income in 1972
Total children [1]	64,303	$11,775	55,221	$12,466	8,146	$6,579
Mother in labor force	26,189	12,597	21,812	13,257	3,984	8,472
Husband-wife families	55,238	12,801	49,710	13,106	4,802	9,328
Mother in labor force	21,871	13,842	18,900	14,198	2,624	11,027
Mother not in labor force	33,367	12,122	30,810	12,441	2,178	7,837
Father employed	51,897	13,090	46,912	13,365	4,318	9,677
Mother in labor force	20,533	14,126	17,830	14,458	2,394	11,406
Mother not in labor force	31,364	12,429	29,082	12,715	1,924	8,214
Father unemployed	1,408	8,798	1,222	8,959	178	7,977
Mother in labor force	614	9,639	495	9,796	120	8,731
Mother not in labor force	794	8,068	727	8,284	58	([2])

TABLE 14.—NUMBER OF CHILDREN UNDER 18 YEARS OLD, MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME IN 1972, TYPE OF FAMILY, LABOR FORCE STATUS OF PARENTS, AND RACE, MARCH 1973—Continued

[Numbers in thousands]

Type of family and labor force status of parents, as of March 1973	All children		White		Negro	
	Number	Median family income in 1972	Number	Median family income in 1972	Number	Median family income in 1972
Father not in labor force	1,933	6,554	1,576	6,932	306	4,977
Mother in labor force	724	8,669	575	9,310	110	6,241
Mother not in labor force	1,209	5,462	1,001	5,751	196	4,457
Female family head	8,344	4,408	4,963	4,942	3,180	3,785
Mother in labor force	4,318	5,749	2,912	6,299	1,360	4,733
Employed	3,873	6,015	2,681	6,495	1,151	5,070
Unemployed	445	3,540	231	4,174	209	2,850
Mother not in labor force	4,026	3,495	2,051	3,698	1,820	3,240
Other male family head	721	10,531	548	11,638	164	6,742

---

[1] Children are defined as "own" children of the family head and include never married sons and daughters, stepchildren, and adopted children. Excluded are other related children such as grandchildren, nieces, nephews, and cousins, and unrelated children.

[2] Median income not shown where base is less than 75,000.

Source: Department of Labor.

TABLE 15.—INCOME DISTRIBUTION OF HUSBAND-WIFE FAMILIES, BY WHETHER OR NOT WIFE HAD EARNINGS, 1959 AND 1972

	Number of families	Percent distribution by family income				
		Total	Under $4,000	$4,000 to $9,999	$10,000 to $14,999	$15,000 and up
1959						
All husband-wife families	39,657,000	100	27.3	56.6	11.1	4.9
Wife had earnings	14,484,000	100	18.6	62.2	15.1	4.0
Wife had no earnings	25,173,000	100	32.3	53.4	8.8	5.5
1972						
All husband-wife families	46,314,000	100	7.9	30.3	28.0	33.6
Wife had earnings	22,478,000	100	3.4	25.0	30.2	41.3
Wife had nc earnings	23,836,000	100	12.1	35.4	26.0	26.4

Source: Bureau of the Census, 1960 Census Reports and 1973 Current Population Survey Reports.

TABLE 16.—INCOME DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALE-HEADED FAMILIES, BY PRESENCE OR ABSENCE OF EARNERS, 1959, 1969, AND 1972

	Number of families	Percent distribution by income				Mean income
		Total	Under $3,000	$3,000 to $9,999	$10,000 and up	
1959						
All female-headed families	4,196,000	100	49.5	44.6	5.8	$3,908
With one or more earners	3,279,000	100	38.5	54.3	7.2	4,563
With no earners	918,000	100	88.7	10.2	1.2	1,570
1969						
All female-headed families	5,515,000	100	30.4	51.5	18.0	6,219
With one or more earners	4,307,000	100	19.1	58.6	22.4	7,252
With no earners	1,208,000	100	71.0	26.2	2.7	2,538
1972						
All female-headed families	6,607,000	100	25.3	53.8	21.0	6,862
With one or more earners	4,971,000	100	15.9	57.3	26.8	8,000
With no earners	1,636,000	100	53.8	42.8	3.2	3,401

Source: Bureau of the Census, 1960 and 1970 Census Reports and 1973 Current Population Survey Reports.

TABLE 17.—CHILDREN RECEIVING AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN (AFDC), BY AGE, 1971 AND 1973

Age group	1971		1973	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All ages	7,014,700	100.0	7,724,938	100.0
Unborn	53,400	0.8	44,022	0.6
Under 3	1,122,500	16.0	1,284,477	16.6
3 to 5	1,224,100	17.4	1,356,669	17.6
6 to 11	2,467,700	35.2	2,681,578	34.7
12 to 13	750,800	10.7	832,042	10.8
14 to 15	676,400	9.6	750,054	9.7
16 to 20	719,800	10.3	776,095	10.0

Source: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TABLE 18.—FAMILIES RECEIVING AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN, BY AGE GROUP OF YOUNGEST CHILD IN FAMILY, 1973

Age Group	Number of families	'Percent of families
Youngest child under age 3	1,111,337	37
Youngest child age 3–5	680,865	23
Youngest child age 6–11	771,222	26
Youngest child age 12 or over	426,467	14
Total, all families	2,989,891	100

Source: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TABLE 19.—AFDC FAMILIES, BY NUMBER OF CHILDREN RECEIVING AID, 1971 AND 1973

Number of children	1971		1973	
	Number of families	Percent	Number of families	Percent
1 or more	2,523,900	100.0	2,989,891	100.0
1	749,200	29.7	1,010,715	33.8
2	617,800	24.5	761,359	25.5
3 or more	1,156,900	45.8	1,217,807	40.7
3	453,400	18.0	488,031	16.3
4	299,700	11.9	327,884	11.0
5	176,300	7.0	185,630	6.2
6 or more	227,500	9.0	216,262	7.2

	1971	1973
Average number of children per family	2.8	2.6

Source: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TABLE 20.—AFDC FAMILIES WITH MOTHER IN HOME, BY MOTHER'S EMPLOYMENT STATUS, 1973, FOR HEW REGIONS AND SELECTED STATES

Specified HEW region or State	Total of such families	Employed and usually works		Not employed			
						Other status	
		Full time	Part time	Incapacitated for employment	Needed in home full time as homemaker	Actively seeking work	Not actively seeking work [1]
Total number	[2] 2,793,547	274,205	174,846	225,715	1,308,993	321,569	487,316
Percent	100	9.8	6.3	8.1	46.9	11.5	17.4
HEW region: [3]							
II	501,287	6.1	3.5	10.0	54.8	6.9	18.7
III	311,541	8.3	4.5	9.9	49.2	10.9	17.2
IV	408,736	14.5	10.3	8.2	33.0	14.3	19.6
V	589,560	8.5	4.8	5.5	50.5	11.0	19.7
VI	237,085	6.3	7.6	8.1	41.7	14.4	21.8
VII	113,036	22.5	6.9	5.1	37.4	10.0	17.9
VIII	59,320	8.4	6.4	3.5	45.4	9.9	26.3
IX	421,822	11.6	7.5	9.6	48.0	15.6	7.7

00069

00070

TABLE 20.—AFDC FAMILIES WITH MOTHER IN HOME, BY MOTHER'S EMPLOYMENT STATUS, 1973, FOR HEW REGIONS AND SELECTED STATES—Continued

Specified HEW region or State	Total of such families	Employed and usually works		Not employed			
						Other status	
		Full time	Part time	Incapacitated for employment	Needed in home full time as homemaker	Actively seeking work	Not actively seeking work [1]
State:							
Alabama	39,052	6.9	12.2	7.2	29.8	18.4	25.5
Arizona	17,914	7.3	5.8	14.9	41.4	9.4	21.0
Arkansas	20,790	11.7	9.1	10.0	33.5	11.3	24.4
California	388,157	11.7	7.5	9.5	48.6	16.0	6.6
Colorado	30,387	7.0	6.7	4.3	47.7	7.5	26.8
Florida	85,645	16.0	14.7	7.3	22.8	12.9	26.3
Georgia	89,794	20.3	9.8	7.2	43.7	13.5	5.5
Illinois	184,712	8.4	2.7	6.9	54.2	8.1	19.8
Indiana	47,259	19.5	6.7	5.7	30.5	15.0	22.6
Iowa	20,323	16.2	9.5	5.0	33.1	8.6	27.6
Kansas	18,695	14.9	6.3	7.6	37.5	11.5	22.3
Kentucky	39,416	6.7	5.4	4.1	45.5	13.7	24.5
Louisiana	60,969	6.2	9.5	9.1	41.2	19.3	14.8
Maryland	56,951	8.9	3.0	6.6	44.2	10.4	26.9
Michigan	152,318	7.2	6.3	4.2	53.3	13.3	15.6

Minnesota	36,427	13.9	10.4	4.8	40.5	9.7	20.7
Mississippi	41,245	20.9	10.2	8.5	18.3	10.3	31.4
Missouri	63,245	26.4	5.9	4.1	39.8	9.7	14.0
Nebraska	10,773	25.1	9.5	7.2	31.1	11.3	15.6
New Jersey	108,600	8.0	5.2	5.8	40.2	11.3	29.5
New York	343,187	6.2	3.3	9.8	58.4	5.9	16.4
North Carolina	37,819	13.6	9.3	12.7	33.1	18.4	12.9
North Dakota	3,668	12.4	11.5	4.9	32.7	5.9	32.6
Ohio	129,621	4.3	3.0	5.7	53.6	11.8	21.5
Oklahoma	26,254	5.8	7.7	7.2	39.4	10.6	29.2
Pennsylvania	158,409	7.6	4.8	11.5	55.1	10.4	10.6
Rhode Island	14,093	5.2	8.1	6.4	46.8	12.1	21.3
South Dakota	5,467	13.8	6.5	2.9	39.0	12.5	25.3
Tennessee	50,506	13.8	7.4	9.2	32.7	16.2	20.6
Texas	113,682	5.7	7.3	7.6	40.7	14.2	24.5
Virginia	41,891	10.6	6.3	7.4	36.7	13.5	25.5
West Virginia	18,755	4.4	2.2	12.9	51.3	12.2	17.0
Wisconsin	39,223	9.9	7.1	3.6	45.6	9.6	24.2

---

[1] May include mothers in work and training programs.

[2] Included 903 families in which the mother's employment status could not be determined.

[3] Regions are—I (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont); II (New York, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands); III (Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia); IV (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, Tennessee); V (Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin); VI (Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas); VII (Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska); VIII (Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming); IX (Arizona, California, Hawaii, Nevada, Guam); X (Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, Washington).

Source: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TABLE 21.—NUMBER AND CAPACITY OF LICENSED OR APPROVED DAY CARE CENTERS AND FAMILY DAY CARE HOMES, 1967-1972[1]

	March 1967	March 1968	March 1969	March 1970	March 1971	March 1972
Number of centers and homes:						
Day care centers	10,400	11,700	13,600	16,700	18,400	20,319
Family day care homes	24,300	27,400	32,700	40,700	55,400	60,967
Total	34,700	39,100	46,300	57,400	73,800	81,286
Capacity of centers and homes:						
Day care centers:						
Public	22,600	27,700	34,700	50,700	65,300	79,401
Voluntary	113,900	139,000	177,900	234,000	287,700	326,431
Independent	239,300	231,000	266,400	293,000	329,600	354,200
Auspices not reported	17,500	40,100	38,900	48,100	36,600	45,329
Subtotal	393,300	437,800	517,900	625,800	719,200	805,361

Family day care homes:						
Public	2,500	3,600	8,000	16,200	26,400	34,300
Voluntary	1,300	2,200	2,200	2,100	14,800	16,216
Independent	63,900	84,600	101,900	121,000	145,600	159,663
Auspices not reported	14,200	6,800	8,300	8,900	5,700	4,662
Subtotal	81,900	97,200	120,400	148,200	192,500	215,841
Total capacity	475,200	535,000	638,300	774,000	911,700	1,021,202

Source: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

[1] Definitions used in table:

Day care.—Day care is defined as a child welfare service which supplements parental care by providing care and protection for children who need care outside their own homes for part of the day because their parents are working or are unable for other reasons to provide adequate parental supervision. Nursery schools, kindergartens, day camps, or other facilities the purpose of which is primarily educational, recreational or for medical treatment are not included under this definition. Day care may be provided in either day care centers or family day care homes.

A day care center is a facility providing care and protection for part of the 24-hour day usually for a group of 6 or more children from 2 to 3 years of age through school age. In this report, group day care homes as defined in Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements are not separately identified, but are included under day care centers.

Public centers are those operated by a unit of State or local government such as a department of public welfare, health or education. Voluntary centers are those operated by a nongovernmental nonprofit organization, such as a social agency, settlement or church. Independent centers are proprietary centers operated for the financial profit of the owners, operators, or managers.

A family day care home is a family home which provides care and protection for part of the 24-hour day usually for from one child to five or six children from infancy through school age. Family day care homes may be supervised directly by a public agency or by a voluntary agency, or may be independent. Independent or proprietary homes are those not supervised directly by a social agency. Licensing of a home alone is not equivalent to direct agency supervision, nor does certification of an independent home as suitable for placement of public agency children make it an agency home so long as the home also receives children who are not known to agencies.

TABLE 22.—LICENSED OR APPROVED DAY CARE CENTERS, BY AUSPICES AND CAPACITY, BY STATE, MARCH 1972

State	Total		Public		Voluntary		Independent	
	Number	Capacity	Number	Capacity	Number	Capacity	Number	Capacity
Total [1]	20,319	805,361	1,963	79,401	7,513	326,431	9,663	354,200
Alabama	409	15,789	84	4,692	105	3,896	220	7,201
Alaska	56	1,359	56	1,359				
Arizona [2]	350	18,000			307	16,930	43	1,070
Arkansas	218	8,114	82	2,637	40	1,687	96	3,790
California [2]	2,385	109,160	320	21,750	1,024	44,350	1,041	43,060
Colorado	235	8,937	11	301	49	2,588	175	6,048
Connecticut	699	25,532	14	644	388	15,265	297	9,623
Delaware [3]	65	2,769			38	1,710	27	1,059
District of Columbia [2]	194	6,399	60	1,000	16	570	118	4,829
Florida	522	23,830	29	1,804	110	7,328	383	14,698
Georgia	1,048	52,036			354	25,488	694	26,548
Hawaii	186	9,478			136	6,659	50	2,819
Idaho	34	1,000					34	1,000
Illinois	602	26,085	20	923	284	12,919	298	12,243
Indiana [2]	87	3,748	6	230	49	2,315	32	1,203
Iowa [3]	483	12,182	77	1,948	406	10,234		
Kansas	171	4,228			70	2,042	101	2,186
Kentucky	536	15,585	160	3,921	112	4,652	264	7,012
Louisiana	315	10,659	29	1,523	80	3,891	206	5,245
Maine	25	1,087			18	880	7	207
Maryland	852	32,232	37	1,765			815	30,467
Massachusetts	1,203	42,035	126	4,408	426	14,887	651	22,740
Michigan [3]	565	18,649	1	30	381	11,759	183	6,860

Minnesota	151	4,943	2	55	93	3,203	56	1,685
Mississippi	21	908	6	269	11	454	4	185
Missouri	333	12,143	2	105	116	4,462	215	7,576
Montana	41	1,254	16	549	10	387	15	318
Nebraska	80	2,838	27	887	22	843	31	1,108
Nevada	60	3,526	7	390	5	304	48	2,832
New Hampshire	53	1,420	20	350	15	600	18	470
New Jersey	256	9,411	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)
New Mexico	76	2,434			27	964	49	1,470
New York	879	34,514	23	1,184	592	23,688	264	9,642
North Carolina	176	7,123	15	551	146	5,928	15	644
North Dakota	27	1,043	18	742	2	40	7	261
Ohio	1,249	45,512	233	5,499	496	20,022	520	19,991
Oklahoma	389	15,935	29	1,271	99	6,173	261	8,491
Oregon	294	12,327	32	2,414	54	2,052	208	7,861
Pennsylvania	438	16,080	262	10,152	130	4,637	46	1,291
Puerto Rico	98	3,433	37	1,176	12	428	49	1,829
Rhode Island	39	2,128			26	1,258	13	870
South Carolina	291	11,464	57	2,932	10	695	224	7,837
South Dakota	12	450	1	50	5	245	6	155
Tennessee	924	35,918	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)
Texas	2,138	91,808			710	39,469	1,428	52,339
Utah	73	3,156	3	210	1	250	69	2,696
Vermont	86	2,440			64	1,926	22	514
Virgin Islands	15	348	7	208	6	110	2	30
Virginia[2]	257	12,196	2	85	135	6,596	120	5,515
Washington	231	9,518			133	5,398	98	4,120
West Virginia	75	2,417			46	1,518	29	899
Wisconsin	291	8,666	52	1,387	140	3,986	99	3,293
Wyoming	26	1,115			14	745	12	370

---

[1] Totals reflect inadequacies of data as noted in other footnotes.
[2] 1970 data.
[3] 1971 data.
[4] Not reported.

Source: National Center for Social Statistics, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TABLE 23.—LICENSED OR APPROVED FAMILY DAY CARE HOMES, BY AUSPICES AND CAPACITY, BY STATE, MARCH 1972

State	Total		Public		Voluntary		Independent	
	Number	Capacity	Number	Capacity	Number	Capacity	Number	Capacity
Total [1]	60,967	215,841	9,803	34,300	6,661	16,216	43,401	159,663
Alabama	841	4,205					841	[4] 4,205
Alaska	113	411	113	411				
Arizona [3]	438	986					438	986
Arkansas	835	3,835	136	574			699	3,261
California [3]	10,811	41,530					10,811	41,530
Colorado	1,800	7,200	63	252			1,737	6,948
Connecticut	715	2,262			31	92	684	2,170
Delaware [3]	216	839					216	839
District of Columbia [3]	321	813	86	225	92	230	143	358
Florida	262	1,151			72	360	190	791
Georgia	68	219	64	195			4	24
Hawaii	118	526					118	526
Idaho	236	719					236	719
Illinois	4,151	14,989	139	502	53	191	3,959	14,296
Indiana [3]	915	4,364	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)
Iowa [3]	918	3,106	918	3,106				
Kansas	1,393	3,915					1,393	3,915
Kentucky	17	102	1	6			16	96
Louisiana	929	4,645	929	4,645				
Maine	103	464	16	59	17	60	70	345
Maryland	1,641	5,364	137	441			1,504	4,923
Massachusetts	458	916					458	916
Michigan [3]	3,529	11,016			8	22	3,521	10,994

00076

Minnesota	2,582	8,300	399	1,282			2,183	7,018
Mississippi	6	25	6	25				
Missouri	1,130	4,879					1,130	4,879
Montana	736	2,758					736	2,758
Nebraska	140	770	1	4			139	766
Nevada	116	584					116	584
New Hampshire	438	1,712			8	64	430	1,648
New Jersey	451	1,189	451	1,189				
New Mexico	207	520	207	520				
New York [2]	8,377	22,730	3,034	10,371	4,643	8,850	700	3,509
North Carolina	40	179	9	45	22	90	9	44
North Dakota	332	1,136	191	666			141	470
Ohio	791	1,828	791	1,828				
Oklahoma	599	2,911					599	2,911
Oregon	1,444	3,610	1,188	2,970	256	640		
Pennsylvania [3]	1,065	3,776			1,065	3,776		
Puerto Rico	95	307	22	43	43	138	30	126
Rhode Island	138	370			12	30	126	340
South Carolina	196	1,870	3	12			193	1,858
South Dakota	178	603	178	603				
Tennessee	187	1,298	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)
Texas	1,411	6,774			294	1,452	1,117	5,322
Utah	614	2,366					614	2,366
Vermont	69	363			44	213	25	150
Virgin Islands [3]	1	8			1	8		
Virginia [2]	986	3,358					986	3,358
Washington	7,026	23,336					7,026	23,336
West Virginia	721	4,326	721	4,326				
Wisconsin								
Wyoming	63	378					63	378

---

[1] Totals reflect inadequacies of data as noted in other footnotes.
[2] 1970 data.
[3] 1971 data.
[4] Estimated.
[5] Not reported.

Source: National Center for Social Statistics, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TABLE 24.—ESTIMATED CHANGES IN SOCIAL SERVICES EXPENDITURES UNDER TITLE IV-A OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1971-72[1]

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Fiscal year 1972 expenditure ranking	Service classification	Expenditures, fiscal year—		Expenditure increase	
		1971	1972	Amount	Percent
1	Child care (day care)	$232.7	$408.5	$175.8	76
2	Child foster care	110.1	240.7	130.6	119
3	Special services for handicapped children	0	150.3	150.3	......
4	Employment and training (non-WIN)	35.7	116.9	81.2	228
5	Child protection	66.0	99.4	33.4	51
6	WIN employment and training	78.8	97.2	18.4	23
	Other 17 classifications	265.3	648.9	383.6	145
	Total	788.6	1,761.9	973.3	123
	6 major services as a percent of the total	66	63	60	......

---

[1] Including both Federal and non-Federal funding.

Source: Touche Ross & Co., "Cost Analysis of Social Services, Fiscal Year 1972."

TABLE 25.—PREPRIMARY SCHOOL ENROLLMENT OF CHILDREN 3 TO 5 YEARS OLD, BY FAMILY INCOME, OCCUPATION OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD, PLACE OF RESIDENCE, AND RACE, 1964–72

[Numbers in thousands]

Characteristic	1964			1970			1972		
	Population	Enrolled		Population	Enrolled		Population	Enrolled	
		Number	Percent		Number	Percent		Number	Percent
Total 3–5 years old	12,496	3,187	25.5	10,949	4,104	37.5	10,166	4,231	41.6
White	10,608	2,747	25.9	9,098	3,443	37.8	8,560	3,542	41.4
Other races	1,888	440	23.3	1,851	661	35.7	1,606	689	42.9
Family income:									
Less than $3,000	2,031	307	15.1	916	224	24.4	841	285	33.9
White	1,178	159	13.5	467	112	24.0	472	148	31.4
Other races	853	148	17.4	450	112	24.9	369	137	37.1
$3,000 to $4,999	2,525	499	19.8	1,312	392	29.9	1,229	410	33.4
White	1,954	348	17.8	869	226	26.0	877	274	31.2
Other races	571	151	26.4	443	116	37.5	352	136	38.8
$5,000 to $7,499	4,063	1,050	25.8	2,277	737	32.4	1,691	580	34.3
White	3,808	977	25.7	1,911	590	30.8	1,407	447	31.8
Other races	255	73	28.6	366	148	40.3	284	134	47.0
$7,500 and over	3,422	1,274	37.2	5,641	2,433	43.1	5,827	2,704	46.4
White	3,284	1,221	37.2	5,184	2,235	40.3	5,287	2,455	46.4
Other races	138	53	38.4	457	197	43.0	540	250	46.3
Occupation of household head:									
White collar	4,110	1,321	32.1	3,807	1,791	47.0	3,414	1,772	51.9
White	3,934	1,244	31.6	3,550	1,652	46.5	3,186	1,654	51.9
Other races	176	77	43.8	257	139	53.9	229	118	51.5

TABLE 25.—PREPRIMARY SCHOOL ENROLLMENT OF CHILDREN 3 TO 5 YEARS OLD, BY FAMILY INCOME, OCCUPATION OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD, PLACE OF RESIDENCE, AND RACE, 1964-72—Continued

[Numbers in thousands]

Characteristic	1964			1970			1972		
	Population	Enrolled		Population	Enrolled		Population	Enrolled	
		Number	Percent		Number	Percent		Number	Percent
Occupation of household head—Continued									
Manual/service	6,146	1,420	23.1	5,231	1,678	32.1	4,764	1,697	35.6
White	5,059	1,157	22.9	4,235	1,359	32.1	3,979	1,376	34.6
Other races	1,087	263	24.2	996	319	32.0	784	321	40.9
Farm	686	86	12.5	346	82	23.6	343	98	28.7
White	526	79	15.0	294	70	23.9	307	89	29.0
Other races	160	7	4.4	51	11	22.1	36	9	25.8
Unemployed [1]	1,116	240	21.5	1,213	415	34.2	1,320	507	38.4
White	696	153	22.0	719	245	34.1	805	286	35.6
Other races	420	87	20.7	494	169	34.3	516	221	42.8
Residence:									
Metropolitan, central	3,618	1,053	29.1	3,088	1,218	39.4	3,029	1,324	43.7
White	2,572	729	28.3	2,101	821	39.1	2,103	906	43.1
Other races	1,046	324	31.0	987	397	40.2	926	418	45.1
Metropolitan, other	4,476	1,329	29.7	3,949	1,705	43.2	3,830	1,784	46.6
White	4,224	1,264	29.9	3,643	1,587	43.6	3,539	1,637	46.3
Other races	252	65	25.8	306	118	38.6	291	174	50.5
Nonmetropolitan	4,403	806	18.3	3,913	1,181	30.2	3,307	1,123	34.0
White	3,813	756	19.8	3,354	1,035	30.9	2,917	999	34.2
Other races	590	50	8.5	558	146	26.1	390	124	31.9

---

[1] Includes persons not in labor force.

Source: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TABLE 26.—PREPRIMARY SCHOOL ENROLLMENT OF CHILDREN 3 TO 5 YEARS OLD, BY CONTROL OF PROGRAM, AGE, AND RACE: OCTOBER 1973

[Numbers in thousands]

Age and race	Total	Total enrolled					
		Total		Public		Private	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total, 3 to 5 years	10,344	4,234	40.9	2,829	27.4	1,405	13.6
White	8,698	3,521	40.5	2,243	25.8	1,278	14.7
Negro and other races	1,646	713	43.3	586	35.6	127	7.7
Negro	1,466	618	42.2	522	35.6	96	6.5
3 years	3,556	515	14.5	137	3.9	378	10.6
White	2,977	417	14.0	77	2.6	340	11.4
Negro and other races	579	98	16.9	60	10.3	38	6.6
Negro	523	90	17.2	55	10.5	35	6.7
4 years	3,443	1,177	34.2	518	15.0	659	19.1
White	2,903	946	32.6	343	11.8	603	20.8
Negro and other races	540	230	42.6	175	32.3	56	10.3
Negro	490	202	41.3	161	32.9	41	8.4
5 years	3,344	2,542	76.0	2,175	65.0	368	11.0
White	2,817	2,157	76.6	1,823	64.7	334	11.9
Negro and other races	527	385	73.1	352	66.8	33	6.3
Negro	453	326	71.9	306	67.6	20	4.4

Source: Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports.

TABLE 27.—PREPRIMARY SCHOOL ENROLLMENT OF CHILDREN 3 TO 5 YEARS OLD, BY REGION, AGE, AND RACE: OCTOBER 1973

[Numbers in thousands]

Age and race	Northeast			North Central			South			West		
		Enrolled			Enrolled			Enrolled			Enrolled	
	Total	Number	Percent	Total	Number	Percent	Total	Number	Percent	Total	Number	Percent
Total, 3 to 5 years	2,217	910	41.0	2,797	1,146	41.0	3,417	1,353	39.6	1,913	825	43.1
White	1,957	798	40.8	2,457	983	40.0	2,621	1,049	40.0	1,663	691	41.5
Negro and other races	260	112	43.1	340	163	47.8	796	304	38.2	250	134	53.6
Negro	239	102	42.6	312	153	49.1	774	293	37.9	141	70	49.9
3 years	748	104	13.9	978	107	10.9	1,128	175	15.5	703	129	18.4
White	661	90	13.6	861	83	9.7	834	131	15.7	621	113	18.2
Negro and other races	87	14	15.8	117	24	20.2	293	44	15.1	82	16	19.7
Negro	79	13	16.2	104	22	21.3	285	44	15.6	54	11	(1)
4 years	727	258	35.4	917	227	30.2	1,160	410	35.4	639	232	36.4
White	640	224	34.9	805	231	28.7	910	311	34.2	548	181	32.9
Negro and other races	87	34	39.0	112	45	40.5	250	99	39.6	91	52	57.2
Negro	85	32	37.4	104	44	42.0	247	97	39.1	53	30	(1)
5 years	742	549	74.0	902	763	84.5	1,129	768	68.0	571	463	81.1
White	656	484	73.8	791	669	84.6	877	607	69.2	494	397	80.4
Negro and other races	86	64	75.2	112	94	84.0	252	161	63.8	77	66	85.4
Negro	75	57	76.3	103	87	84.6	242	152	62.8	33	30	(1)

---

[1] Base less than 75,000.

Source: Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports.

TABLE 28.—PREPRIMARY SCHOOL ENROLLMENT OF CHILDREN 3 TO 5 YEARS OLD IN FULL-DAY AND PART-DAY ATTENDANCE, BY AGE AND RACE, OCTOBER 1973

[Numbers in thousands]

Age and race	Preprimary enrollment			
	Full day		Part day	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total, 3 to 5 years	958	22.6	3,276	77.4
White	638	18.1	2,883	81.9
Other races	320	44.9	393	55.1
Negro	278	44.9	341	55.1
3 years	178	34.5	338	65.5
White	124	29.7	293	70.3
Other races	54	54.7	44	45.3
Negro	52	58.2	38	41.8
4 years	303	25.7	874	74.3
White	180	19.0	766	81.0
Other races	122	53.1	108	46.9
Negro	106	52.6	96	47.4
5 years	478	18.8	2,064	81.2
White	333	15.5	1,824	84.5
Other races	145	37.5	240	62.5
Negro	119	36.5	207	63.5

Source: Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports.

TABLE 29.—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE ESTIMATE OF NATIONAL CHILD CARE FUNDING, Fiscal Years 1974–1975

Federal Child Care Expenditures[1]

Agency program	Estimated Federal obligations (millions)		Child care years		Federal cost per child		Sources/assumptions
	Fiscal year 1974	Fiscal year 1975	Fiscal year 1974	Fiscal year 1975	Fiscal year 1974	Fiscal year 1975	
I. Department of Agriculture:							
Nonschool food service program:							
(a) Head Start	$13.3	$25.0					Appendix to the U.S. budget, fiscal year 1975, p. 203. Number of children served and "other year round" NSFS obligations provided by USDA budget staff. Estimates include food service to preschool children in Head Start and other year round preschool programs and exclude summer service to school-aged children.
(b) Other year round	30.0	34.0					
USDA total	43.3	59.0	278,000	55[illegible],000	$156	$106	
II. Appalachian Regional Commission: Child development program.	12.3	12.3	145,000	145,000	85	85	ARC. Estimate reflects a 40-percent increase in program level for fiscal year 1974 and fiscal year 1975.

III. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:							
Aid to families with dependent children;							
IV-A—Social services:							
Employment related	325.0	[2] 341.3	368,063	[2] 386,466	883	883	Community Services Administration (CSA/SRS). Obligation figure is a central office estimate based on assumed 25-percent increase over fiscal year 1973. Cost per child is a central office estimate based on 5-percent increase over fiscal year 1973 unit cost. Estimates assume proportion of child care to total budget request will remain the same in fiscal year 1974.
Nonemployment related	139.3	[2] 146.3	157,758	[2] 165,685	883	883	See IV-A—Social services employment related (above).
IV-A—Special needs	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	CSA/SRS. Limited data from regions obtained prior to 1969 suggest expenditures may exceed $50,000,000.
IV-A—Income disregard	85.0	[2] 89.3	200,000	[2] 210,000	425	425	CSA/SRS. Fiscal year 1974 estimates reflect projections based on information supplied by half the States in a child care survey, fiscal year 1971.
IV-A—Work incentive	45.0	[2] 47.3	75,350	[2] 79,118	597	598	CSA/SRS. Fiscal year 1974 figures taken from central office program level estimate.

00085

Federal Child Care Expenditures [1]—Continued

Agency program	Estimated Federal obligations (millions)		Child care years		Federal cost per child		Sources/assumptions
	Fiscal year 1974	Fiscal year 1975	Fiscal year 1974	Fiscal year 1975	Fiscal year 1974	Fiscal year 1975	
IV-B—Child Welfare...........	1.8	1.8	19,000	19,000	95	95	CSA/SRS. Central office estimate. Though this program has declined in scope since fiscal year 1971, Federal involvement remains stable. Estimates of children served are based on HEW trend data from child welfare statistics fiscal year 1968–69 (NCCS report CW-1, tables 6+32).
Head Start.....................	392.1	430.0	379,000	379,000	1,034	1,135	Appendices to the U.S. budget, fiscal year 1975 p. 465; include goods, services, and administrative costs.
Office of Education...........	48.9	51.3	138,909	145,854	352	352	Office of Education, NCES. Estimate for fiscal year 1974 taken directly from NCES, national summary tables for fiscal year 1972 released May 20, 1974 (table 1, Matrix 02 and table 20, Matrix 21). Fiscal year 1975 estimates assume a 5-percent

							increase in funding level attributable to inflation. Both estimates assume stability of program level for numbers of children served and include preschool components of all OE programs. Calculations assume that unit expenditure is the same for children above and below primary school entrance line and extrapolates from number of kindergarten and prekindergarten children participating in subsidized programs to reach funding levels.
HEW total	1,037.1	1,107.3	1,338,080	1,385,123	775	799	
IV. Department of Housing and Urban Development:							
Indoor community facilities program							HUD. Program discontinued.
Model Cities	14.2	6.7	28,400	13,400	500	500	HUD. Model Cities program is being phased out. Estimates for number of children served are based on HUD survey showing unit cost of $500 per child.
Neighborhood facilities	NA		NA		NA		HUD. Program to be discontinued in fiscal year 1975.
Tenant services grant program	NA		NA		NA		Do.
HUD total	14.2	6.7	28,400	13,400	500	500	

Federal Child Care Expenditures [1]—Continued

Agency program	Estimated Federal obligations (millions)		Child care years		Federal cost per child		Sources/assumptions
	Fiscal year 1974	Fiscal year 1975	Fiscal year 1974	Fiscal year 1975	Fiscal year 1974	Fiscal year 1975	
V. Department of Interior:							
Indian child welfare assistance...	5.4	6.5	3,600	3,600	1,500	1,806	DOI.
Kindergarten program for Indian children in Federal schools.	2.0	2.0	4,300	4,300	465	465	DOI. Includes operational costs only
Parent-child development program (preschool).	.6	.6	200	200	3,000	3,000	DOI. Includes operations, construction and equipment.
Johnson O'Malley—Program of aid for public schools (kindergarten for reservation Indian children).	2.2	2.2	NA	NA	NA	NA	DOI. Program scope has increased since fiscal year 1973 to include K–12.
DOI total......................	10.2	11.3	8,100	8,100	1,259	1,395	
VI. Department of Labor:[3]							
Concentrated employment program (CEP).	10.0	10.0	NA	NA	NA	NA	DHEW estimate extrapolated from fiscal year 1970 data.
Out of school work support.......	5.0	6.0	NA	NA	NA	NA	DOL/Manpower Administration.
Migrants..........................	1.3	1.6	NA	NA	NA	NA	Do.
Public Service Careers (PSC)........							DOL/Manpower Administration. Program has been discontinued.
DOL total.......................	16.3	17.6	NA	NA	NA	NA	

VII. Office of Economic Opportunity:							
Assistance for migrants and seasonal farmworkers (EOA III–B).	....	....	....	....	....	....	OEO/special programs staff. Transferred to Labor Department in fiscal year 1974.
Community action program (225 local initiative funds).[4]	2.4	2.4	NA	NA	NA	NA	OEO/special programs staff.
VIII. Small Business Administration	3.8	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	SBA. Includes 82 business loans for construction, new buildings, and renovation of existing facilities housing day-care centers, group day care, Head Start, nursery schools, and preschool centers.
IX. Department of the Treasury: Internal Revenue Service, child care deductions.	208.6	208.6	NA	NA	NA	NA	Derived from IRS projection for 1974 based on tax returns for 1972 (*cf.* Table 41, p. 103) and from resultant reduction in tax liability as estimated (for 1972) by Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation (cf. Table 40, p. 102). Estimate assumes child care equals 90 percent of total deductions for dependent care.
Total Federal child care expenditures.	1,348.2	1,425.2	1,797,580	2,110,623	1,117	1,039	

Non-Federal Contributions to Federally Supported Child Care Programs

Agency program	State matching share (millions)		Local share		Private 3d party		Sources/assumptions
	Fiscal year 1974	Fiscal year 1975	Fiscal year 1974	Fiscal year 1975	Fiscal year 1974	Fiscal year 1975	
I. Department of Agriculture: Nonschool food service program.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	USDA.
II. Appalachian Regional Commission	$4.1	$4.1	(5)	(5)	NA	NA	HEW estimate extrapolated from ARC estimates of Federal expenditures. This figure reflects combined State and local funding, assumes 75-percent Federal share. That assumption results in an overestimate since some ARC programs are still at 100-percent Federal funding.
III. Department of Health, Education and Welfare:							
IV-A—Social services:							
Employment related	108.3	113.7	NA	NA	NA	NA	CSA/SRS.
Nonemployment related	46.4	48.7	NA	NA	NA	NA	CSA/SRS.
IV-A—Special needs	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	CSA/SRS.
IV-A—Income disregard	56.7	59.5	NA	NA	NA	NA	CSA/SRS.
IV-A—Work incentive	5.0	5.3	NA	NA	NA	NA	C3A/SRS.
Child welfare	19.2	19.2	(5)	(5)	NA	NA	CSA/SRS.
Head Start	98.0	107.5	(5)	(5)	NA	NA	HEW Budget Office.
Office of Education: Early childhood programs.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	OE. No state/local match requirements.
HEW total	333.6	353.9					

IV. Department of Housing and Urban development.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	HUD. Some Model Cities funds are used in state match for title IV-A expenditures. No local match requirements.
V. Department of the Interior	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	DOT/Bureau of Indian Affairs.
VI. Department of Labor:							
Out of school work support	.6	.7	NA	NA	NA	NA	DOL.
Migrants	.1	.2	NA	NA	NA	NA	DOL.
DOL total	.7	.9					
VII. Office of Economic Opportunity: Community Action Program.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	OEO.
VIII. Small Business Administraion	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	SBA.
Total non-Federal contributions to federally supported child care programs.	338.4	358.9					

---

[1] Expenditures for the following are excluded even though some may provide full or part-day child care:

(a) Grants for training educational and/or day care personnel.
(b) Research and development funds.
(c) Administrative grants.
(d) Health program funds for children.
(e) Summer programs for teenagers.
(f) Programs for teenagers before and after school (Neighborhood Youth Corps, Department of Interior recreation programs).
(g) Grants to school systems for postkindergarten children.
(h) Parent training and home intervention programs (e.g. Department of Agriculture extension programs for improved family living).

[2] Fiscal 1975 estimates assume stability of program level for title IV-A programs (Federal outlays benefitting the poor, summary tables HEW/ASPE/OS, March 1974) with a token 5-percent increase over fiscal year 1974 funding (SRS central office estimate).

[3] All Department of Labor programs have been consolidated into a revenue sharing program beginning fiscal year 1975. Fiscal year 1975 estimates thus represent a best estimate as to how States will apportion that money rather than allocation for specific programs.

[4] OEO local initiative funds have been transferred to the States under revenue sharing.

[5] Included in State share.

NA=Not available.

Source: Table prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TABLE 30.—CHILD CARE FUNDED UNDER PART A OF TITLE IV OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1970 THROUGH 1974

Program	Child care years	Yearly cost per child/year			Total cost (thousands)	Federal share (thousands)
		Total	Federal	State		
Fiscal year 1970 (total)	443,472	$4[illegible]	$324	$151	$211,084	$144,013
Work incentive program	57,500	428	321	107	24,591	18,443
AFDC social services	83,327	1,094	820	274	91,160	68,370
AFDC income disregard	302,645	315	189	126	95,333	57,200
Fiscal year 1971 (total)	568,587	570	397	173	324,290	226,293
Work incentive program	98,000	394	296	98	38,652	28,989
AFDC social services	128,670	1,343	1,007	336	172,805	129,604
AFDC income disregard	341,917	330	198	132	112,833	67,700

Fiscal year 1972 (total)	768,341	691	492	199	531,242	378,392
Work incentive program	91,700	537	403	134	49,333	37,000
AFDC social services	291,290	1,196	897	299	348,306	261,230
AFDC income disregard	385,351	347	208	139	133,603	80,162
Fiscal year 1973 (total)	736,980	922	674	248	680,198	497,399
Work incentive program	80,100	624	562	62	50,000	45,000
AFDC social services	456,880	1,084	813	271	495,198	371,399
AFDC income disregard	200,000	675	405	270	135,000	81,000
Fiscal year 1974 (total)	801,136	1,012	742	270	810,665	594,249
Work incentive program	75,350	664	597	67	50,000	45,000
AFDC social services	525,786	1,177	883	294	618,998	464,249
AFDC income disregard	200,000	708	425	284	141,667	85,000

Figures shown for **AFDC social services** do not relate to children of AFDC mothers with training and employment under the Work Incentive Program. Figures shown for the **AFDC income disregard** relate to children of employed AFDC mothers whose care is financed in part by disregard of earned income for child care costs. This in effect raises the amount of the welfare payment the mother would be eligible for and Federal sharing would be reflected in the cash assistance funds rather than social services funds. Some duplication in child care years exists between AFDC social services and AFDC income disregard due to some women receiving child care supplementation from both sources. The estimate on unit costs eliminates any duplication.

Source: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TABLE 31.—SOCIAL SERVICES UNDER TITLE IV, PART A OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT: DAY CARE—ESTIMATED FEDERAL SHARE OF COSTS, AVERAGE NUMBER OF CHILDREN, AND AVERAGE COST PER CHILD—FISCAL YEARS 1973 AND 1974 (EXCLUDING CHILD CARE UNDER THE WORK INCENTIVE PROGRAM)[1]

State	Federal share of costs (fiscal year)		Average number of children in care (fiscal year)		Average annual cost per child (fiscal year)	
	1973[2]	1974[3]	1973	1974	1973[6]	1974[8]
All States	$371,398,853	($464,248,566)	(456,880)	(525,786)	$813	($883)
Alabama	5,794,000	(7,242,500)	(7,447)	(8,865)	(778)	(817)
Alaska	225,000	(281,250)	(259)	(309)	868	(911)
Arizona	1,803,000	(2,253,750)	(3,370)	(4,010)	535	(562)
Arkansas	1,606,000	(2,007,500)	(3,395)	(4,039)	[7](473)	(497)
California	41,117,853	(51,397,316)	(36,420)	(43,373)	[7](1,129)	(1,185)
Colorado	5,620,000	(7,025,000)	(13,224)	(15,751)	425	(446)
Connecticut	4,547,000	(5,683,750)	(5,532)	(6,586)	822	(863)
Delaware	3,286,000	(4,107,500)	(3,599)	(4,283)	913	(959)
District of Columbia	917,000	(1,146,250)	(728)	(866)	[7](1,260)	(1,323)
Florida	[4] 13,761,000	(17,201,250)	(26,668)	(31,737)	516	(542)

Georgia	[4] 13,500,000	(16,875,000)	(9,948)	(11,842)	1,357	(1,425)
Hawaii	1,262,000	(1,577,500)	(1,333)	(1,587)	947	(994)
Idaho	214,000	(267,500)	(240)	(286)	890	(935)
Illinois	21,304,000	(26,630,000)	(29,838)	(35,507)	714	(750)
Indiana	[4] 675,000	(843,750)	(702)	(835)	962	(1,010)
Iowa	2,982,000	(3,727,500)	(3,913)	(4,659)	726	(800)
Kansas	2,109,000	(2,636,250)	(7,641)	(9,091)	276	(290)
Kentucky	7,459,000	(9,323,750)	(6,305)	(7,507)	1,183	(1,242)
Louisiana	2,607,000	(3,258,750)	(4,574)	(5,440)	570	(599)
Maine	[4] 1,631,000	(2,038,750)	(2,157)	(2,568)	756	(794)
Maryland	[3] 4,350,000	(5,437,500)	(4,828)	(5,748)	901	(946)
Massachusetts	[3] 6,277,000	(7,846,250)	(3,955)	(4,710)	[7] (1,587)	(1,666)
Michigan	18,263,000	(22,828,750)	(31,380)	(37,363)	582	(611)
Minnesota	5,953,000	(7,441,250)	(13,812)	(16,427)	431	(453)
Mississippi	1,685,000	(2,106,250)	(2,004)	(2,385)	841	(883)
Missouri	4,861,000	(6,076,250)	(9,722)	(11,574)	(500)	(525)
Montana	565,000	(706,250)	(1,093)	(1,300)	517	(543)
Nebraska	2,723,000	(3,403,750)	(4,385)	(5,220)	621	(652)
Nevada	54,000	(67,500)	(110)	(131)	(491)	(516)
New Hampshire	1,545,000	(1,931,250)	(2,641)	(3,145)	585	(614)

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 31.—SOCIAL SERVICES UNDER TITLE IV, PART A OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT: DAY CARE—ESTIMATED FEDERAL SHARE OF COSTS, AVERAGE NUMBER OF CHILDREN, AND AVERAGE COST PER CHILD—FISCAL YEARS 1973 AND 1974 (EXCLUDING CHILD CARE UNDER THE WORK INCENTIVE PROGRAM) [1]—Continued

State	Federal share of costs (fiscal year)		Average number of children in care (fiscal year)		Average annual cost per child (fiscal year)	
	1973 [3]	1974 [5]	1973	1974	1973 [6]	1974 [8]
New Jersey	15,786,000	(19,732,500)	(15,492)	(18,442)	1,019	(1,070)
New Mexico	2,324,000	(2,905,000)	(4,733)	(5,630)	(491)	(516)
New York	69,254,000	(86,567,500)	(54,402)	(64,748)	1,273	(1,337)
North Carolina	6,130,000	(7,662,500)	(5,186)	(6,174)	1,182	(1,241)
North Dakota	105,000	(131,250)	(216)	(257)	486	(510)
Ohio	9,210,000	(11,512,500)	(31,220)	(37,137)	295	(310)
Oklahoma	8,941,000	(11,176,250)	(12,082)	(14,384)	740	(777)
Oregon	12,307,000	(15,383,750)	(13,985)	(16,649)	880	(924)
Pennsylvania	[9] 41,239,000	(51,548,750)	(18,223)	(21,696)	[7](2,263)	(2,376)
Rhode Island	912,000	(1,140,000)	(690)	(822)	[7](1,321)	(1,387)
South Carolina	800,000	(1,000,000)	(496)	(590)	[7](1,613)	(1,694)

South Dakota	393,000	(491,250)	(601)	(715)	654	(687)
Tennessee	1,481,000	(1,851,250)	(1,059)	(1,261)	1,398	(1,468)
Texas	[3] 6,173,000	(7,716,250)	(6,318)	(7,521)	977	(1,026)
Utah	822,000	(1,027,500)	(1,386)	(1,649)	593	(623)
Vermont	1,512,000	(1,890,000)	(2,528)	(3,010)	598	(628)
Virginia	[9] 2,553,000	(3,191,250)	(9,934)	(11,819)	[7](257)	(270)
Washington	6,154,000	(7,692,500)	(15,157)	(18,058)	406	(426)
West Virginia	482,000	(602,500)	(1,430)	(1,702)	[7](337)	(354)
Wisconsin	6,113,000	(7,641,250)	(5,293)	(6,299)	[7](1,155)	(1,213)
Wyoming	[3] 12,000	(15,000)	(66)	(79)	181	(190)

---

[1] All data in parentheses are Central Office estimates.

[2] Unless otherwise noted, all fiscal year 1973 expenditure data based on data supplied by States on the DHEW/SRS/OA-41.7(b).

[3] Based on data supplied in the February 1974 DHEW/SRS/OA-25.

[4] Reflects data supplied in special survey of States in fiscal year 1973.

[5] Estimated expenditures for fiscal year 1974 assumes 25 percent increase over expenditures for fiscal year 1973.

[6] Unless otherwise noted, all unit costs for fiscal year 1973 reflect estimates supplied by States in a special survey conducted in 1973.

[7] Reflects unit costs supplied in earlier surveys of States.

[8] Estimated unit cost for fiscal year 1974 assumes a 5 percent increase over unit cost for fiscal year 1973.

[9] Reflects data supplied in the November 1972 DHEW/SRS/OA-25.

Source: Table prepared by Community Services Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TABLE 32.—NUMBER OF CHILDREN REPORTED RECEIVING CHILD CARE UNDER THE WORK INCENTIVE PROGRAM

	Last day of—								
	December 1969	June 1970	December 1970	June 1971	December 1971	June 1972	December 1972	June 1973	December 1973
Alabama	1,200	1,900	2,200	2,300	1,800	2,100	1,375	3,865	3,058
Alaska	370	300	340	490	740	880	593	600	339
Arizona	(1)	(1)	(1)	2,200	1,600	1,300	1,434	1,386	1,264
Arkansas	650	1,200	1,900	2,000	2,400	2,700	2,624	2,934	2,386
California	(1)	(1)	6,700	[2] 6,300	[2] 5,900	[3] 6,600	7,903	4,347	5,188
Colorado	1,200	2,700	3,200	2,900	2,400	[4] 2,600	1,288	1,893	2,662
Connecticut	1,500	1,600	2,100	2,000	2,200	[illegible],200	4,352	4,245	4,151
Delaware	(1)	740	770	740	1,000	[illegible],200	[11] 2,189	1,312	1,846
District of Columbia	(1)	640	960	(1)	2,300	2,700	2,509	2,671	3,300
Florida	2,000	4,200	4,900	6,100	6,900	6,000	3,502	4,001	5,634
Georgia	1,500	7,500	9,700	3,100	3,300	3,300	3,535	3,589	7,165
Hawaii	44	29	58	35	46	11	84	197	409
Idaho	670	820	810	620	710	600	634	908	1,060
Illinois	[6] 460	[6] 430	3,100	3,900	4,100	4,400	[4] 1,430	2,087	3,983
Indiana	(7)	(1)	1,100	1,600	2,100	[4,5] 2,200	1,328	3,308	2,602

Iowa	1,200	1,600	1,400	2,000	2,000	1,900	[11] 1,931	2,048	2,030
Kansas	1,100	990	940	1,300	1,600	2,000	1,722	2,292	1,489
Kentucky	6,100	4,500	3,900	3,900	4,000	3,900	1,614	2,249	1,671
Louisiana	2,000	2,800	2,800	3,000	2,300	2,600	1,935	2,305	1,813
Maine	200	910	1,100	1,500	1,600	1,600	1,353	1,169	1,326
Maryland	[8] 460	[8] 920	3,700	4,700	5,300	4,900	4,172	1,267	4,512
Massachusetts	(1)	810	1,600	[9] 910	[9] 690	[9] 780	[9] 712	[9] 790	3,124
Michigan	7,900	8,200	9,100	[10] 5,000	[10] 5,800	[10] 5,400	[10] 5,811	8,892	8,994
Minnesota	(1)	2,100	2,700	3,700	4,100	4,700	4,094	4,482	4,121
Mississippi	(1)	(1)	1,100	[4] [9] 1,300	1,000	1,100	875	3,519	4,328
Missouri	2,700	2,800	2,800	2,200	1,300	840	[11] 843	1,472	[13] 1,472
Montana	260	560	580	760	460	650	[12] 768	703	857
Nebraska	150	(1)	540	530	530	660	342	345	541
Nevada	(7)	27	160	150	180	130	307	365	362
New Hampshire	(7)	(7)	(5)	(7)	71	110	279	399	466
New Jersey	2,900	3,700	4,100	4,900	5,500	7,300	5,297	6,032	7,038
New Mexico	240	910	940	930	760	760	337	555	526
New York	(1)	15,400	17,800	23,100	19,400	23,100	[11] 23,066	[11] 23,066	[11] 23,066
North Carolina	340	1,100	1,300	1,300	1,400	1,300	833	1,411	2,224
North Dakota	320	330	320	340	290	380	370	457	403

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 32.—NUMBER OF CHILDREN REPORTED RECEIVING CHILD CARE UNDER THE WORK INCENTIVE PROGRAM—Continued

	Last day of—								
	December 1969	June 1970	December 1970	June 1971	December 1971	June 1972	December 1972	June 1937	December 1973
Ohio	(1)	(1)	1,700	1,900	1,700	1,600	2,047	1,748	4,055
Oklahoma	200	740	880	770	920	1,300	1,850	1,542	2,132
Oregon	350	600	1,100	1,400	2,400	3,400	3,591	3,349	3,668
Pennsylvania	3,800	4,700	4,900	4,600	4,700	5,700	4,[illegible]40	5,301	5,233
Rhode Island	(1)	850	720	1,000	920	800	767	692	732
South Carolina	240	220	240	330	560	700	414	1,552	1,963
South Dakota	300	310	480	520	490	510	389	546	420
Tennessee	2,600	4,100	2,800	3,000	2,800	2,500	1,8[illegible]1	3,975	3,931
Texas	(1)	(1)	(1)	3,800	3,700	3,600	3,896	7,194	7,159
Utah	1,400	2,200	2,500	3,000	3,200	860	1,194	1,420	1,325

Vermont	190	260	250	240	540	440	[4] 466	451	87
Virginia	550	3,000	3,400	4,200	4,100	4,400	2,810	3,535	3,466
Washington	([1])	([1])	([1])	([1])	1,100	2,300	1,881	1,409	1,473
West Virginia	([1])	820	560	820	1,000	1,600	2,226	1,580	1,350
Wisconsin	1,900	([1])	4,100	4,200	5,100	5,600	5,958	4,603	7,285
Wyoming	190	280	290	270	240	430	857	424	492
Guam				75	45	([1])	34	38	[12] 38
Puerto Rico	6,000	8,500	8,300	7,600	6,200	5,600	4,555	4,859	4,091
Virgin Islands				75	87	71	50	8	16
Total	53,200	96,300	127,000	134,000	135,000	146,000	130,297	147,703	164,426

---

[1] Not reported.
[2] Excludes Orange County.
[3] Excludes Contra Costa County.
[4] Estimated.
[5] Program not fully implemented.
[6] Excludes Cook County.
[7] No program initiated.
[8] Excludes Baltimore City.
[9] Incomplete.
[10] Excludes Wayne County.
[11] Data for June 30, 1972.
[12] Data for Sept. 30, 1972.
[13] Data for Sept. 30, 1973.

Source: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Service.

00101

00102

TABLE 33.—CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS REPORTED UNDER THE WORK INCENTIVE PROGRAM, BY TYPE OF ARRANGEMENT

	Last day of—								
	December 1969[1]	June 1972[2]	December 1970[3]	June 1971[4]	December 1971[5]	June 1972[6]	December 1972[7]	June 1973[8]	December 1973[9]
Care provided in child's own home:									
Children under 6 years old	11,400	22,400	26,500	31,500	30,200	33,500	27,081	22,864	22,397
Children 6 to 14 years old	15,800	26,100	31,900	33,600	31,100	32,200	28,936	31,495	32,837
Subtotal	27,100	48,600	58,500	65,000	61,300	65,800	56,017	54,539	55,234

Care provided in relative's home:									
Children under 6 years old.	2,800	5,200	7,000	7,700	8,000	9,000	7,622	6,721	7,197
Children 6 to 14 years old.	2,700	4,900	5,700	6,400	6,500	7,200	6,644	7,665	8,034
Subtotal......	5,500	10,100	12,700	14,100	14,500	16,200	14,266	14,386	15,231
Care provided in day care facility:									
Children under 6 years old.....	6,400	11,800	17,700	18,500	21,100	22,700	20,483	18,807	22,574
Children 6 to 14 years old.	4,000	8,400	10,100	11,200	10,700	11,900	10,037	12,593	12,872
Subtotal......	10,400	20,200	27,900	29,800	31,700	34,500	30,520	31,400	35,446

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 33.—CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS REPORTED UNDER THE WORK INCENTIVE PROGRAM, BY TYPE OF ARRANGEMENT—Continued

	Last day of—								
	December 1969 [1]	June 1972 [2]	December 1970 [3]	June 1971 [4]	December 1971 [5]	June 1972 [6]	December 1972 [7]	June 1973 [8]	December 1973 [9]
Other arrangements:									
Children under 6 years old	1,300	3,700	5,900	5,700	5,700	7,000	6,534	3,589	3,615
Children 6 to 14 years old	8,800	14,000	21,000	19,000	22,000	22,100	22,860	20,903	28,478
Subtotal	10,200	17,700	26,900	24,700	27,700	29,100	29,494	24,492	32,093

00104

Total, all arrangements:									
Children under 6 years old..	21,900	43,200	57,100	63,500	64,900	72,200	61,820	51,981	55,783
Children 6 to 14 years old..	31,300	53,400	68,900	70,200	70,200	73,400	68,477	72,656	82,221
Total.........	53,200	96,600	126,000	134,000	135,000	146,000	130,297	124,637	138,004

---

[1] States reporting, representing 52 percent of the families receiving AFDC in December 1969.

[2] States reporting, representing 70 percent of the families receiving AFDC in June 1970.

[3] 47 States reporting, representing 93 percent of the families receiving AFDC in December 1970.

[4] 51 jurisdictions reporting, representing 98 percent of the families receiving AFDC in June 1971.

[5] 54 jurisdictions reporting.

[6] 53 jurisdictions reporting, representing slightly less than 100 percent of the families receiving AFDC in June 1972.

[7] Includes incomplete data for 2 States.

[8] Excludes data for New York; data for one State are incomplete.

[9] Excludes data for Delaware, Guam, Missouri, and New York.

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding.

Source: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Service.

TABLE 34.—NUMBER OF MOTHERS OR OTHER CARETAKERS PARTICIPATING IN THE WIN PROGRAM AND NUMBER OF THEIR CHILDREN PROVIDED CHILD CARE, BY AGE GROUP AND BY STATE, AS OF THE LAST DAY OF THE QUARTER ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1973

State	Number of mothers or other caretakers	Number of children		
		Total	Under 6 years of age	6 through 14 years of age
Total [1]	67,357	139,850	[2] 55,783	[2] 82,221
Alabama	1,372	3,058	1,506	1,552
Alaska	191	339	204	135
Arizona	520	1,264	745	519
Arkansas	1,492	2,386	1,120	1,266
California	2,906	5,188	2,158	3,030
Colorado	1,314	2,662	721	1,941
Connecticut	2,023	4,151	1,734	2,417
Delaware	769	1,846	(2)	(2)
District of Columbia	1,554	3,300	1,759	1,541
Florida	2,743	5,634	2,264	3,370
Georgia	3,396	7,165	3,859	3,306
Guam	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Hawaii	40	409	245	164
Idaho	565	1,060	465	595
Illinois [3]	1,306	3,983	2,042	1,941
Indiana	1,176	2,602	1,064	1,538
Iowa	1,074	2,030	817	1,213
Kansas	716	1,489	458	1,031
Kentucky	780	1,671	659	1,012
Louisiana	759	1,813	484	1,329
Maine	861	1,326	570	756
Maryland	2,093	4,612	1,373	3,239
Massachusetts	1,302	3,124	1,096	2,028
Michigan	5,339	8,994	2,920	6,074
Minnesota	2,055	4,121	1,422	2,699
Mississippi	1,740	4,328	1,822	2,506
Missouri	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Montana	448	857	413	444
Nebraska	295	541	295	246
Nevada	210	362	196	166

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 34.—NUMBER OF MOTHERS OR OTHER CARETAKERS PARTICIPATING IN THE WIN PROGRAM AND NUMBER OF THEIR CHILDREN PROVIDED CHILD CARE, BY AGE GROUP AND BY STATE, AS OF THE LAST DAY OF THE QUARTER ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1973—Continued

State	Number of mothers or others caretakers	Number of children		
		Total	Under 6 years of age	6 through 14 years of age
New Hampshire	236	466	186	280
New Jersey	2,817	7,038	3,083	3,955
New Mexico	254	526	291	235
New York	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
North Carolina	908	2,224	852	1,372
North Dakota	236	403	267	136
Ohio	1,764	4,055	1,306	2,749
Oklahoma	1,002	2,132	560	1,572
Oregon	2,436	3,668	1,777	1,891
Pennsylvania	3,021	5,233	1,711	3,522
Puerto Rico	1,281	4,091	1,156	2,935
Rhode Island	413	732	309	423
South Carolina	829	1,963	683	1,280
South Dakota	254	420	284	136
Tennessee	1,724	3,931	1,457	2,474
Texas	3,190	7,159	2,752	4,407
Utah	924	1,325	781	544
Vermont	41	87	24	63
Virgin Islands	9	16	16	0
Virginia	1,850	3,466	1,250	2,216
Washington	796	1,473	697	776
West Virginia	651	1,350	534	816
Wisconsin	3,467	7,285	3,147	4,138
Wyoming	215	492	249	243

---

[1] Incomplete; data not reported by Guam, Missouri, and New York.
[2] Age of children not reported for 1,846 children in Delaware.
[3] Estimated.

Source: National Center for Social Statistics, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

00107

TABLE 35.—NUMBER OF MOTHERS OR OTHER CARETAKERS WHO COULD NOT BE CERTIFIED TO THE STATE MANPOWER AGENCY FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE WIN PROGRAM SOLELY BECAUSE ADEQUATE CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS WERE NOT AVAILABLE AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN REQUIRING CHILD CARE, BY AGE GROUP, AND BY STATE, AS OF THE LAST DAY OF THE QUARTER ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1973

State	Number of mothers or other caretakers	Number of children		
		Total	Under 6 years of age	6 through 14 years of age
Total [1]	2,482	5,594	2,164	3,430
Alabama	183	416	215	201
Alaska	2	3	1	2
Arizona	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Arkansas	1	4	1	3
California	0	0	0	0
Colorado	4	7	2	5
Connecticut	50	103	67	36
Delaware	0	0	0	0
District of Columbia	102	194	103	91
Florida	35	74	28	46
Georgia	194	307	167	140
Guam	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Hawaii	1	1	1	0
Idaho	0	0	0	0
Illinois [2]	104	181	115	66
Indiana	39	67	41	26
Iowa	40	89	24	65
Kansas	33	90	28	62
Kentucky	3	10	6	4
Louisiana	3	4	2	2
Maine	3	4	4	0
Maryland	177	440	101	339
Massachusetts	38	91	30	61
Michigan	65	114	46	68
Minnesota	2	2	2	0
Mississippi	6	8	6	2
Missouri	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Montana	0	0	0	0
Nebraska	0	0	0	0
Nevada	0	0	0	0

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 35.—NUMBER OF MOTHERS OR OTHER CARETAKERS WHO COULD NOT BE CERTIFIED TO THE STATE MANPOWER AGENCY FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE WIN PROGRAM SOLELY BECAUSE ADEQUATE CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS WERE NOT AVAILABLE AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN REQUIRING CHILD CARE, BY AGE GROUP, AND BY STATE, AS OF THE LAST DAY OF THE QUARTER ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1973—Con.

State	Number of mothers or others caretakers	Number of children		
		Total	Under 6 years of age	6 through 14 years of age
New Hampshire	0	0	0	0
New Jersey	0	0	0	0
New Mexico	0	0	0	0
New York	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
North Carolina	56	127	56	71
North Dakota	0	0	0	0
Ohio	15	30	23	7
Oklahoma	0	0	0	0
Oregon	0	0	0	0
Pennsylvania	553	1,148	273	875
Puerto Rico	113	409	143	266
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	37	74	33	41
South Dakota	0	0	0	0
Tennessee	62	131	46	85
Texas	541	1,414	582	832
Utah	0	0	0	0
Vermont	0	0	0	0
Virgin Islands	0	0	0	0
Virginia	13	35	10	25
Washington	0	0	0	0
West Virginia	0	0	0	0
Wisconsin	0	0	0	0
Wyoming	7	17	8	9

---

[1] Incomplete; data not reported by Arizona, Guam, Missouri, and New York.
[2] Excludes Cook County, downstate estimated data only.

Source: National Center for Social Statistics, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TABLE 36.—CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS, BY TYPE OF ARRANGEMENT AND AGE GROUP, FOR CHILDREN OF WORK INCENTIVE PROGRAM (WIN) PARTICIPANTS AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1973[1]

Type of arrangement	Number of children Total	 Under age 6	 Age 6 through 14
All arrangements	138,004	55,783	82,221
Care in child's home (total)	55,234	22,397	32,837
Cared for by father	2,821	753	2,068
Cared for by other relative	31,668	13,605	18,063
Cared for by nonrelative	20,352	7,858	12,494
Homemaker service	393	181	212
Care in relative's home (total)	15,231	7,197	8,034
Care in day-care facility (total)	35,446	22,574	12,872
Family day-care home	20,285	11,139	9,146
Group day-care home	726	541	185
Day-care center	14,435	10,894	3,541
Care other than in home or day-care facility (total)	32,093	3,615	28,478
Work or training only during child's school hours	14,214	801	13,413
Child cares for self	8,529	....	8,529
Other	9,350	2,814	6,536

---

[1] Data incomplete: Delaware, Guam, Missouri, and New York, did not report.

Source: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TABLE 37.—CHILD CARE PROVIDED UNDER CHILD WELFARE SERVICES PROGRAM (TITLE IV-B OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT)

	Fiscal year—					
	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973
Number of children provided day care on December 31, at middle of fiscal year:						
In day care centers	14,600	16,700	20,600	23,800	14,950	12,350
In family day care homes	4,400	5,900	8,400	11,200	8,050	6,650
Total	19,000	22,600	29,000	35,000	23,000	19,000
Expenditures for day care (in millions)[1]	$14.7	$20.8	$28.3	$35.8	$24.4	$21.0

[1] Total expenditures from Federal and non-Federal funds. The effective rate of Federal matching for child welfare services under title IV-B is such that the Federal share for 1973 amounts to about $1.8 million.

Source: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Service, "Child Welfare Statistics" 1968 and 1969 (NCSS Report CW-1), tables 6 and 32. Estimated expenditure data for fiscal years 1971 and 1972 provided by the 1971 and 1972 reports of the Touche-Ross Cost Analysis of Social Services. Fiscal Year 1970 expenditures estimated on the basis of available trend data. The estimates of children served reflect projections based on trend data supplied by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Service, "Child Welfare Statistics" 1968 and 1969 (NCSS Report CW-1), tables 6 and 32.

TABLE 38.—CHILDREN IN FULL-YEAR, FULL-DAY HEAD START PROGRAMS BY STATE, FISCAL YEAR 1973, AND FEDERAL COSTS

State	Number of children	Amount	Average per child cost
Total	118,347	$123,208,506	$1,041
Alabama	4,762	5,115,859	1,074
Alaska			
Arizona	1,268	1,455,324	1,148
Arkansas	2,932	3,278,132	1,118
California	1,215	2,555,841	2,104
Colorado	412	74,317	180
Connecticut	730	684,588	938
Delaware	346	262,400	758
District of Columbia	1,001	1,996,099	1,994
Florida	8,266	8,806,726	1,065
Georgia	4,505	4,425,055	982
Hawaii			
Idaho	356	345,805	971
Illinois	2,514	2,270,863	903
Indiana	280	183,391	655
Iowa	416	342,411	823
Kansas	529	370,611	701
Kentucky	1,498	1,085,081	724
Louisiana	3,838	4,388,573	1,143
Maine	225	116,904	520
Maryland	1,736	2,518,251	1,451
Massachusetts	773	254,831	330
Michigan	1,040	443,703	427
Minnesota	505	248,160	491
Mississippi	19,581	22,010,782	1,124
Missouri	1,215	1,412,589	1,163
Montana	312	218,830	701
Nebraska	538	118,950	221
Nevada	510	120,920	237
New Hampshire	214	93,706	438

TABLE 38.—CHILDREN IN FULL-YEAR, FULL-DAY HEAD START PROGRAMS BY STATE, FISCAL YEAR 1973, AND FEDERAL COSTS—Continued

State	Number of children	Amount	Average per child cost
New Jersey	2,539	$4,259,605	$1,678
New Mexico	350	287,202	821
New York	5,083	11,193,715	2,222
North Carolina	3,123	3,525,701	1,129
North Dakota			
Ohio	4,435	4,642,527	1,047
Oklahoma	2,399	2,273,483	948
Oregon	1,492	712,767	478
Pennsylvania	2,318	3,089,214	1,333
Rhode Island	245	154,272	630
South Carolina	3,654	4,179,536	1,144
South Dakota			
Tennessee	4,756	4,923,521	1,035
Texas	9,079	11,610,303	1,279
Trust Territory	107	68,991	645
Utah	447	170,302	381
Vermont	470	32,473	69
Virginia	1,945	3,107,122	1,597
Washington	1,024	1,058,974	1,034
West Virginia	1,001	742,306	742
Wisconsin	929	1,085,986	1,169
Wyoming			

Source: Office of Child Development, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TABLE 39.—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE SPECIAL FOOD SERVICE PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN—YEAR-ROUND (DAY-CARE AND HEAD START) SEGMENT

	Fiscal year—		
	1973 (preliminary)	1974 (preliminary)	1975 (estimate)[1]
Outlets (number of sites):			
Total (average)	4,000	6,200	7,500
Head Start	([2])	1,000	2,000
Average daily participation (number of children):			
Peak month	222,000	367,000	([2])
Average	195,000	262,000	[3] 559,000
Meals served: Total (cumulative)	116,000,000	161,000,000	328,000,000

00111

Of total meals (percent):			
Free or reduced price	87	89	90
Breakfasts	17	18	(2)
Lunches	33	34	(2)
Suppers	2	1	(2)
Supplemental food (snacks, etc.)	48	47	(2)
Funding and commodity assistance:			
Total obligations	$18,100,000	$27,000,000	$59,000,000
Average reimbursement per meal (excluding equipment costs) (cents)	15.3	17.0	18
Percentage of equipment funding in total obligations	2	3	(2)
Commodity assistance (in addition to cash funding)	$2,200,000	$3,100,000	(2)

---

[1] Fiscal year 1975 figures are based on the estimates prepared for the fiscal year 1975 budget submission. However, it is very important to note that actual expenditures, participation, and meals served have, traditionally, been substantially less than originally estimated for budget purposes. For example, although about $43,000,000 was budgeted for about 241,000,000 meals in fiscal year 1974, August 1974 estimates indicate that only about $27,000,000 was spent for 161,000,000 meals.

[2] Not available.

[3] Yearend.

Source: USDA, Food and Nutrition Service, Program Reporting Staff, August 1974.

TABLE 40.—ESTIMATED REDUCTION IN TAX LIABILITY BECAUSE OF DEDUCTIBILITY OF CHILD AND DEPENDENT CARE EXPENSES, 1972

Adjusted gross income class	Reduction in tax liability
Total	$224,000,000
$0 to $3,000	([1])
$3,000 to $5,000	3,000,000
$5,000 to $7,000	12,000,000
$7,000 to $10,000	41,000,000
$10,000 to $15,000	89,000,000
$15,000 to $20,000	68,000,000
$20,000 to $50,000	11,000,000

[1] Less than $500,000.

Source: Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, September 23, 1974.

TABLE 41.—NUMBER OF TAXABLE RETURNS AND AMOUNT OF DEDUCTION UNDER THE FEDERAL INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX PROVISIONS FOR A DEDUCTION FOR THE CARE OF DEPENDENT CHILDREN, DISABLED DEPENDENTS, AND DISABLED SPOUSES

[By adjusted gross income class, calendar years 1954, 1960, 1966, 1970, and 1972]

Adjusted gross income class (thousands)	1954[1]		1960[1]		1966[2]		1970[2]		1972[3]	
	Number of taxable returns	Amount of deduction (thousands)	Number of taxable returns	Amount of deduction (thousands)	Number of taxable returns	Amount of deduction (thousands)	Number of taxable returns	Amount of deduction (thousands)	Number of taxable returns	Amount of deduction (thousands)
0 to $3	36,036	$12,279	28,043	$10,646	8,755	$3,392	7,727	$2,125	235	$54
$3 to $5	135,491	40,915	128,416	46,773	72,483	37,723	109,952	39,642	26,396	16,082
$5 to $7	40,580	12,995	54,845	21,200	100,025	55,759	169,951	75,967	92,568	70,792
$7 to $10	16,068	5,688	23,993	9,746	32,333	15,869	107,367	49,925	339,307	213,025
$10 to $15	2,016	929	7,315	3,199	14,453	7,452	91,625	32,711	621,657	425,615
$15 to $20	373	208	645	285	2,815	1,220	32,680	6,822	386,343	286,170
$20 to $50	469	225	813	417	1,763	1,362	20,196	3,582	54,633	35,702
$50 to $100	33	18	68	44	145	85	1,500	391	175	63
$100 or more	11	7	17	12	30	27	217	75	12	4
Total	231,077	73,264	244,155	92,322	232,802	122,889	541,215	211,240	1,521,306	1,047,507

[1] Under the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.
[2] Under the provisions of the Revenue Act of 1964.
[3] Under the provisions of the Revenue Act of 1971.

Source: Compiled by the Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation from *Statistics of Income, Individual Income Tax Returns, 1954 1960, 1966, 1970,* and *1972.* September 5, 1974.

TABLE 42.—LICENSING OF CHILD CARE CENTERS OFFERING GROUP CARE UNDER STATE LICENSING REGULATIONS

State	State Department responsible for licensing	Child care centers licensed			Exemptions from State licensing requirements	Political subdivisions with separate child care center licensing requirements
		If number of children exceeds—	If age of children is—			
			Between—	And—		
Alabama	Pensions and Security	6	3[1]	21	Kindergartens, nursery schools other daytime programs operated by public elementary systems, secondary school units or institutions of higher learning, or operated as part of private school and receive children under school age for 4 hours a day or less, or which operate no more than 4 hours a day and receive children under school age; shopping center connected facilities (that meet local and state fire and health requirements) operating over 4 hours a day which provide temporary care to transient children of parents occupied on premises; centers on federal premises; special activities programs for school age children (which meet local and State fire and health requirements) conducted by civic, charitable or governmental organizations.	

Alaska	Health and Social Services.	6	(2)	16	Primarily educational facilities, temporary care by friends or neighbors.	Greater Anchorage borough.
Arizona	Health	4	(2)	16	Homes of parents or blood relatives; religious organizations conducting child care services in conjunction with religious services, public, private or parochial schools.	
Arkansas	Social and Rehabilitative Services.	(2)	3[3]	(2)	Religious instruction schools or classes; noncustodial educational facilities; public school kindergartens; churches or businesses operating short period care service for parents attending services or shopping; arrangements for care of 6 or less children of not more than 4 families at the same time; facilities operated by religious organizations as of July 1, 1969 whose boards certify facility compliance with State or local fire, safety and health standards and substantial compliance with published State child care facility standards.	

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 42.—LICENSING OF CHILD CARE CENTERS OFFERING GROUP CARE UNDER STATE LICENSING REGULATIONS—Continued

State	State Department responsible for licensing	Child care centers licensed			Exemptions from State licensing requirements	Political subdivisions with separate child care center licensing requirements
		If number of children exceeds—	If age of children is—			
			Between—	And—		
California	Public Health	10	2[4]	18	Relatives by blood or affinity within the second degree; guardians; uncompensated occasional care or regular care of not more than 3 hours per day to children from 1 family by parental friends, facilities under license jurisdiction of another State agency.	
Colorado	Social Services	12	2½[5]	16	Religious instruction schools or classes; hospitals and maternity homes licensed by State Health Department; church and shopping center operated facilities providing short period service while parents attending services or patronizing business; juvenile courts; occasional child care; kindergartens in elementary schools.	Denver.
Connecticut	Health	4	4 weeks[6]	(7)	Public and private school facilities; teacher training labs for accredited institutions of higher education; after-school or vacation recreation facilities; informal in-own-home care by relatives or neighbors.	East Hartford.

Delaware	Health and Social Services.	11	(2)	18	State owned and controlled institutions; maternity wards of general hospitals.	
District of Columbia	Human Resources	5	(2)	15	Relatives within the fourth degree; guardians.	
Florida (Dade, Duval, Orange counties only).	Health and Rehabilitative Services.	5	(7)	[5] 17	Schools and colleges; institutions subject to regulation by another governmental agency; preschool programs of less than 4 hours per day; child care programs on U.S. property other than in a federal housing project.	Alachua, Brevard, Broward, Clay, Collier, Escambia, Hillsborough, Lake, Lee, Leon, Manatee, Martin, Okaloosa, Palm Beach, Pinellas, Polk, Sarasota, Volusia counties.
Georgia	Human Resources	6	(2)	18	Child welfare agencies and facilities (where children and youth are detained) operated by State, county, or municipal government.	Gwinnett county.
Hawaii	Social Services and Housing.	5	2	(2)	Primarily educational, social, or athletic facilities; occasional care by friends, relatives, or neighbors.	
Idaho	Environmental and Community Services.	4	(2)	18	Occasional or irregular care of neighbor's, friend's or relative's children by person not ordinarily engaged in child care.	Boise, Pocatello.
Illinois	Children and Family Services.	8	(2)	18	Kindergartens, nursery schools, etc., operated by school systems or institutions of higher learning; shopping center day care services; day care centers on federal government premises, other special activities programs conducted by charitable and governmental organizations.	Chicago, Danville, East St. Louis.

See footnotes at end of table.

00121

TABLE 42.—LICENSING OF CHILD CARE CENTERS OFFERING GROUP CARE UNDER STATE LICENSING REGULATIONS—Continued

State	State Department responsible for licensing	Child care centers licensed			Exemptions from State licensing requirements	Political subdivisions with separate child care center licensing requirements
		If number of children exceeds—	If age of children is—			
			Between—	And—		
Indiana	Public Welfare	(2)	6 weeks[9]	(2)	State institutions maintained and operated by State; schools and bona fide educational institutions.	
Iowa	Social Services	5	2	(2)	Institutions under management of Department of Social Services.	
Kansas	Health	6	2 weeks.[10]	16	State-operated institutions	
Kentucky	Human Resources	6	(2)	18	Facilities operated by religious organizations while religious services are being conducted.	
Louisiana	Health and Social Rehabilitation Services.	4	(2)	17	Facilities under State management; part-time programs of 4 hours or less; facilities providing only irregular care (hourly basis); elementary schools having grades in addition to nursery and kindergarten which accept children only over 2 years and 8 months of age.	

Maine	Health and Welfare	12	2½	16	Primarily educational facilities	Portland, Lewiston.
Maryland	Health and Mental Hygiene.	4	2[11]	16	Facilities operated by boards of education.	Baltimore City and County, Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties.
Massachusetts	Office for Children	(2)	3[11]	[12] 7	Public school systems; private school systems whose services are not primarily limited to kindergarten, nursery or preschool services; Sunday schools conducted by religious institutions; facilities operated by religious organizations where children are cared for while parents are attending religious services; informal arrangements among neighbors or relatives; occasional child care.	
Michigan	Social Services	6	2½	18	Sunday schools conducted by religious institutions; short term care facilities operated by religious organizations while parents attend services; local and State government child care organizations.	

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 42.—LICENSING OF CHILD CARE CENTERS OFFERING GROUP CARE UNDER STATE LICENSING REGULATIONS—Continued

State	State Department responsible for licensing	Child care centers licensed			Exemptions from State licensing requirements	Political subdivisions with separate child care center licensing requirements
		If number of children exceeds—	If age of children is—			
			Between—	And—		
Minnesota	Public Welfare	5	6 weeks.	13	Facilities managed and controlled by Welfare Commissioner or Youth Conservation Commission; facilities supervised or licensed by other State agencies; facilities caring for children from only 1 family; day care facilities providing short duration services while parents on premises; day care facilities doing business for less than 30 days in any year; facilities adjudged primarily educational (except those regulations affecting child health and safety); homes caring for children placed there for legal adoption unless adoption not complete within 2 years after placement; care by relatives.	
Mississippi	Health	5	(1)	6	Facilities operating as kindergartens, nursery schools or Head Starts in conjunction with public, private or parochial elementary and/or secondary school systems whose primary purpose is a structured school readiness program.	

Missouri	Public Health and Welfare.	6	2	17	Facilities operated by a school system; facilities operated by a business establishment for customer convenience; graded boarding schools, nursery schools, summer camps, hospitals, sanitariums or homes conducted primarily to provide education, recreation, medical treatment, or nursing or convalescent care for children; well-known religious orders; institutions or agencies maintained or operated by State, city or county.	Kansas City, St. Louis.
Montana	Social and Rehabilitation Services.	6	2	12	Primarily educational group facilities; care by relatives or legal guardians.	
Nebraska	Public Welfare	7	2	16	Casual care at irregular intervals.	Lincoln, Omaha.
Nevada	Human Resources	4	(2)	18	Homes of natural parents or guardians; foster homes; maternity homes; homes of relatives within the third degree of consanguinity or affinity; child care facilities in counties or incorporated cities with established child care licensing agency and ordinance requiring licensure; facilities operated and maintained by U.S. Government.	Clark and Washoe Counties, Las Vegas.

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 42.—LICENSING OF CHILD CARE CENTERS OFFERING GROUP CARE UNDER STATE LICENSING REGULATIONS—Continued

State	State Department responsible for licensing	Child care centers licensed			Exemptions from State licensing requirements	Political subdivisions with separate child care center licensing requirements
		If number of children exceeds—	If age of children is—			
			Between—	And—		
New Hampshire	Health and Welfare	6	3[13]	16	Summer camps; hospitals; public schools; approved private schools; facilities providing temporary care not exceeding 30 days; State, county, and town officials performing authorized welfare functions.	Concord.
New Jersey	Institutions and Agencies.	5	2	6	State Board of Child Welfare; aid societies of church or fraternal groups organized for relief of members; certain other agencies subject to supervision of State Department of Institutions and Agencies; public agencies operated by county, city, municipality or school district.	
New Mexico	Health and Social Services.	4	(2)	(2)	Federally operated facilities; public schools; private schools (other than for retarded or disturbed children); nurseries in churches for children of parents attending services.	

New York	Social Services	6	8 weeks[6]	15	Day camps; kindergartens or nurseries operated by schools providing elementary or secondary education; after school religious education programs; cities including one or more counties; parents, relatives.	New York City.
North Carolina	Office of Child Day Care Licensing.	5	(2)	13	Public schools; nonpublic schools which serve public school age children; summer camps (full time), summer day camps; vacation Bible schools; relatives, guardians, legal custodians.	Charlotte, Durham Jacksonville.
North Dakota	Social Services	(2)	(14)	(2)	Homes or institutions under State management and control; relatives within second degree of the parents.	
Ohio	Public Welfare	4	(2)	(2)	Child care in places of worship during religious services; programs under supervision of State Department of Education conducted by boards of education or nonpublic schools in which no child attends more than 4 hours per day; programs conducted during summer vacation of the public schools.	Cincinnati.

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 42.—LICENSING OF CHILD CARE CENTERS OFFERING GROUP CARE UNDER STATE LICENSING REGULATIONS—Continued

State	State Department responsible for licensing	Child care centers licensed			Exemptions from State licensing requirements	Political subdivisions with separate child care center licensing requirements
		If number of children exceeds—	If age of children is—			
			Between—	And—		
Oklahoma	Institutions, Social and Rehabilitative Services.	5	([2])	18	Informal arrangements with friends, neighbors and others; in-own-home care; nursery schools, kindergartens and other primarily educational, recreational or medical treatment facilities; homes of relatives.	Oklahoma City.
Oregon	Human Resources	4	2	15	In-own-home care; occasional care by person not ordinarily engaged in providing day care; care by providers of medical services; facilities providing primarily educational care (unless to preschool children for over 4 hours); facilities providing supervised training in specific subjects; care incident of athletic or social activities sponsored by club or hobby group; facilities operated by school district, political subdivision of State or governmental agency; group care for physically handicapped children or the mentally retarded; parents, guardians, others acting in loco parentis; relatives within the fourth degree.	Portland, Multnomah County.

Pennsylvania	Public Welfare	6	3	16	Care in places of worship during religious services; nonprofit day care centers; facilities operated by State or Federal Governments or supervised by State Department of Public Welfare.
Rhode Island	Social and Rehabilitative Services.	2	3	14	Relatives; institutions receiving aid from or maintained by town, city, or State; institutions with special charters; charitable institutions established in the State on Apr. 30, 1948; nursery schools operating less than 4 hours per day.
South Carolina	Social Services	(2)	(2)	(2)	Facilities existing on Mar. 19, 1956 operated by established religious denominations; State Children's Bureau; State funded facilities; primarily educational facilities.
South Dakota	Public Welfare	5	(2)	14	Primarily educational services (including nursery schools); recreational or summer camps; casual care-babysitting; exchange care under informal mutual arrangements; care furnished by legal guardians or institutions operated by other departments of State government (other than Public Welfare.)

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 42.—LICENSING OF CHILD CARE CENTERS OFFERING GROUP CARE UNDER STATE LICENSING REGULATIONS—Continued

State	State Department responsible for licensing	Child care centers licensed			Exemptions from State licensing requirements	Political subdivisions with separate child care center licensing requirements
		If number of children exceeds—	If age of children is—			
			Between—	And—		
Tennessee	do	12	6 weeks[6]	17	Kindergarten programs for 5 year old children that operate on essentially the same time schedule as public school kindergartens.	
Texas	do	6	(2)	14	State institutions	Austin.
Utah	Social Services	6	2	14	Care by relatives; care in centers provided by boards of education or parochial educational institutions.	
Vermont	Human Services	11	(2)	16	Persons caring for children of not more than 2 families (other than that of provider of care); hospital or establishment licensed by Department of Health, or operator of recreational or therapeutic program, unless the child care services are not incidental to its primary purpose; day care facilities operated by religious organizations in connection with religious services or church sponsored activities; Department of Education supervised preschools for children of less than compulsory school age.	

Virginia	Welfare and Institutions.	9	(2)	18	Facilities required to be licensed as summer camps; public schools, private schools other than those operating a child care center outside the scope of regular classes; schools for educational instruction of children 3–5 years of age in which those 3 or 4 years of age attend no more than 4 hours per day and those 5 years, no more than 6½ hours per day; occasional care provided on hourly basis.	Hampton, Newport News, Martinsville, Alexandria, Fairfax, and Arlington Counties.
Washington	Social and Health Services.	(2)	1 month[18]	(2)	Relatives; casual care by friends and neighbors or care on mutual exchange basis; nursery schools or kindergartens, primarily educational and in which no child enrolled over 4 hours per day; schools; seasonal recreational or educational camps of 3 months or less duration; hospitals licensed under 70.41 RCW; facilities providing care while parents on premises to participate in activities other than employment; certain facilities for the mentally and physically handicapped; agencies in operation prior to March 1957 not receiving State or federal funds, and supported in part by an endowment or trust.	

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 42. LICENSING OF CHILD CARE CENTERS OFFERING GROUP CARE UNDER STATE LICENSING REGULATIONS.—Continued

State	State Department responsible for licensing	Child care centers licensed			Exemptions from State licensing requirements	Political subdivisions with separate child care center licensing requirements
		If number of children exceeds—	If age of children is—			
			Between—	And—		
West Virginia	Welfare	5	2	(2)	County shelters for delinquent children or those charged with delinquency.	
Wisconsin	Health and Social Services.	3	(16)	7	Care by relatives or guardians; public or parochial schools; YMCA; in-own-home care for less than 24 hours a day.	
Wyoming	Health and Social Services.	11	2[17]	17	In-own-home care; occasional care by person not regularly engaged in such activity; informal exchange of care by parents on mutually cooperative basis; day care agencies providing care for less than 3 minors under 17 years of age; foster homes supervised by State or local government unit or school district; ranches or farms which do not offer services to homeless, delinquent or retarded children; summer camps operated by nonprofit organizations.	Casper, Cheyenne.

00132

HEW Recommended Guides for Day Care Licensing[18]	[19]0 0 month.	18	Public or private educational facilities in providing legally authorized educational and related functions; occupied residences in which day care is regularly provided only for a child or children related to the resident caregiver, or only for the child or children of one unrelated family, or only for a combination of such children.

---

[1] Children under 3 generally admitted only to day care centers for children under 3; however, pending revision of regulations, children 2½ to 3 may continue to be served by other centers licensed before July 1969.

[2] Not specified.

[3] Children under 3 admitted only to day care centers for infants.

[4] Children under 2 admitted only to infant group care facilities.

[5] Applicable to large day care centers; State also licenses other group facilities for infants, toddlers and older children.

[6] If facility meets requirements for group care of infants and children under 3.

[7] Children under 2 admitted only if provision made for needs of infants to be met consistently by 1 person.

[8] Dade and Duval counties.

[9] Children under 2 admitted only if facility also meets infant toddler standards.

[10] If facility meets additional regulations for infants and toddlers (under 2½).

[11] Prior approval required for admission of children under 2; in Massachusetts, under 3.

[12] School age children (i.e., 7 or over) may be admitted for care outside school hours only if special provisions made for service to this group not to interfere with care of younger children.

[13] Children under 3 admitted only to group facilities licensed as day care nurseries.

[14] Special approval required for licensure to admit children under 3.

[15] Children under 2½ accepted only in special situations with special permission from the Department.

[16] Children under 2 accepted only in centers having no more than 8 children in the group.

[17] Children under 2 admitted only to infant day care centers.

[18] Guidance document, issued by the U.S. Office of Child Development, intended to serve as source material for use, as appropriate, in the development of State and local day care licensing regulations.

[19] If structure other than private residence; 12, if private residence.

Note: Current as of Mar. 15, 1974.

00134

TABLE 43.—CHILD CARE CENTERS: MINIMUM STAFFING REQUIREMENTS, BY AGE OF CHILDREN, UNDER STATE LICENSING REGULATIONS

	Maximum number of children per staff member [1] if age of children is—						Minimum number of adults on premises
	Under 2	2 to 3	3 to 4	4 to 5	5 to 6	School age	
Alabama [2]		[3] 10	10	20	20	25	2
Alaska	5	5	10	10	10	10	2
Arizona	8	10	15	20	25	25	[4] 2
Arkansas [2]			12	12	12	12	([5])
California [2]		12	12	12	12	12	1
Colorado [2]		[3] 8	10	12	15	15	[6] 2
Connecticut	4	4	([5])	([5])	([5])	([5])	2
Delaware	[7] 8	[8] 15	15	20	20	25	1
District of Columbia	[9] 10	10	10	10	10	([5])	[10] 1
Florida	5	10	10	10	10	15	1
Georgia	[11] 10	10	15	18	20	25	2
Hawaii	([12])	10	15	20	25	25	1
Idaho	[11] 8	[8] 10	10	10	10	([5])	[13] 1
Illinois	6	8	10	[14] 10	25	25	1
Indiana	[15] 5	5	10	12	15	20	2

Iowa	(12)	6	12	15	18	25	[16] 1
Kansas	[17] 5	[18] 7	10	[19] 10	[19] 10	16	1
Kentucky	6	8	10	12	15	15	[4] 2
Louisiana [20]	[9] 14	14	14	14	14	14	[4] 2
Maine	(12)	[3] 8	10	15	18	20	2
Maryland	(12)	6	10	10	13	(5)	1
Massachusetts	(21)	(21)	[19] 10	[19] 10	[22] 15	(22)	2
Michigan	(23)	[3] 10	10	12	20	(5)	2
Minnesota	[24] 7	[25] 10	10	10	10	15	1
Mississippi	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)	(26)	(5)
Missouri	(12)	5	10	10	15	15	2
Montana [20]	(12)	8	8	10	13	13	2
Nebraska	(12)	5	7	7	7	12	2
Nevada	2	10	10	10	10	15	1
New Hampshire [2]			10	15	18	20	[27] 1
New Jersey [20]	(12)	8	10	12	20	(26)	2
New Mexico	10	10	15	[28] 15	[28] 15	15	1
New York	[24] 5	5	5	7	7	10	1
North Carolina [29]	8	12	15	20	25	25	(5)
North Dakota	4	4	10	10	12	12	[27] 1

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 43.—CHILD CARE CENTERS: MINIMUM STAFFING REQUIREMENTS, BY AGE OF CHILDREN, UNDER STATE LICENSING REGULATIONS—Continued

	Maximum number of children per staff member [1] if age of children is—						Minimum number of adults on premises
	Under 2	2 to 3	3 to 4	4 to 5	5 to 6	School age	
Ohio [30]	[31] 10	10	15	15	20	20	[32] 2
Oklahoma [20]	[24] 6	8	12	15	15	20	[33] 1
Oregon	([12])	10	10	10	10	[34] 15	1
Pennsylvania	([21])	([21])	8	10	10	13	2
Rhode Island	([21])	([21])	10	15	25	([5])	2
South Carolina	6	8	10	14	15	15	2
South Dakota	5	5	8	8	8	10	2
Tennessee	[7] 6	8	10	15	25	30	1
Texas	[24] 6	8	12	15	18	[35] 20	1
Utah	([12])	10	15	15	20	25	2
Vermont	4	5	10	10	10	12	2
Virginia	3	10	10	10	10	10	2
Washington	[7] 7	[25] 10	10	10	10	10	[4] 2
West Virginia [36]	([12])	8	10	15	18	20	[13] 1
Wisconsin	[37] 4	[38] 8	10	12	16	16	[39] 2
Wyoming [2]		8	10	15	20	25	1

00136

HEW Recommended Guides for Day Care Licensing.....	4	5	10	10	12	[10] 12	(41)

---

[1] Includes only persons providing child care; when there is a mixture of ages, the ratio for the youngest child is generally applicable.

[2] Applicable to centers licensed to accept children 2½ and over; in Arkansas, 3 and over; in California, 2 and over; in New Hampshire, 3 and over, in Wyoming, 2 and over.

[3] 2½ to 3.

[4] When the number of children exceeds 10.

[5] Not specified.

[6] When 7 or more children present.

[7] 5, if children under 1.

[8] 8, if children under 2½.

[9] 6, if children under 1½.

[10] At least 2 in attendance for any group of more than 10 children over 6.

[11] 7, if children under 1½

[12] Children under 2 generally may not be accepted.

[13] 2, if possible.

[14] If full day; 20, if half day.

[15] Toddlers (i.e., walking to 2); 4, if infants (i.e., 6 weeks to walking).

[16] In mornings and evenings when less than 6 children present.

[17] 3, if children not walking.

[18] 5, if children under 2½.

[19] 12, if part day; in Massachusetts, if children in care 3 hours or less.

[20] Recommended or desirable child-staff ratios.

[21] Children under 3 generally may not be accepted.

[22] 25, if children (aged 5 and 6) in care 3 hours or less; school age children not admitted for care outside school hours in absence of special provisions for that age group.

[23] Children under 2½ generally may not be accepted.

[24] 4, if children under 16 months; in New York and Texas, if children under 1½; in Oklahoma, if infants in cribs.

[25] 7, if children under 31 months; in Washington, if children under 2½.

[26] Children over 5 generally may not be accepted.

[27] 2d required attendant may be teenager, in New Hampshire, must be at least 16.

[28] 20, if children in care 3 hours or less.

[29] Applicable to centers with 30 or more children. If less than 30, ranging from infancy to 13 years, required staff is: 1 (6 to 10 children), 2 (11 to 20 children), 3 (21–29 children).

[30] Applicable to full-time facilities.

[31] 8, if children under 1½.

[32] When 5 or more children present.

[33] For each floor.

[34] 10, for 6 year olds.

[35] 25, if children 8 or over.

[36] Permissible ratios for centers large enough to group by age.

[37] 3, if children under 1.

[38] 6, if children under 2½.

[39] When the number of children exceeds 9.

[40] 16, if children 7 to 12; 20, if 12 to 14.

[41] ½ the staff required by the applicable ratios for children in the facility at that time.

Note: Current as of Mar. 15, 1974.

TABLE 44.—QUALIFICATIONS OF CHILD CARE CENTER STAFF REQUIRED UNDER STATE LICENSING REGULATIONS

State	Qualifications of director		Qualifications of other staff		Medical examination required—	
	Minimum age	Education and experience	Minimum age	Education and experience	Initially	Annually
Alabama [1]		High school or equivalent; college training if more than 30 children in center; 3 months experience.		High school or equivalent	X	X
Alaska	21	High school or group child care experience.			X	X
Arizona	21		[2] 18		(3)	(3)
Arkansas [1]	21	High school	[4] 16	Ability to read and write	X	(5)
California [1]	18	High school plus 12 semester units in early childhood education plus courses in administration plus experience or college degree.	18	Teacher—High school or equivalent, or enrollment in high school plus 2 years experience, and 12 units in early childhood education completed before or after employment.	X	(3)
Colorado [1]		24 college credits in child development, psychology, sociology, nutrition, preschool or daycare administration, plus experience.	[6] 19	Group leader—Bachelor's degree or other combinations of education and experience, or 36 months experience.	X	X
Connecticut		High school or equivalent plus 1 year experience and pursuing further preparation, or 20 years service as program director.		Program assistant—High school or equivalent and pursuing further preparation, or 20 years service as program assistant.	X	X

Delaware	21	High school plus formal training in early childhood development plus 3 years experience, or 4 year college degree in early childhood development or equivalent plus 1 year experience.[7]	[8] 18	Teacher—High school or equivalent plus 1 year experience plus 2 courses in early childhood development or equivalent, or 4 year college course in early childhood development plus 3 months experience. Infant staff—Training or experience in infant care.	×	×
District of Columbia		Equipped for work by training and experience.		Equipped for work by training and experience.	(9)	(9)
Florida		do		do	(10)	(10)
Georgia	(11)	Recent training in child development and/or experience.	(12)	Completion of recent child care training (within 3 years).	×	×
Hawaii	(13)	4 years college plus 2 years experience, or 2 years college plus 4 years experience.	(13)	Teacher—Bachelor's degree with either courses in early childhood development or experience, or 2 years college with training in early childhood education, or completion of in-service training program in early childhood education. Assistant teacher—High school, or other relevant education, or experience.	×	×
Idaho		Equipped for work required		Equipped for work required	(14)	
Illinois	21	2 years college, or high school or equivalent plus either 3 years experience or plan for acquisition of 2 years college credits.	[15] 21	Child care worker—same as director Assistant to child care worker—high school or equivalent, or training in child care. Teacher and other professionals—Required certification or license to practice.	×	(16)

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 44.—QUALIFICATIONS OF CHILD CARE CENTER STAFF REQUIRED UNDER STATE LICENSING REGULATIONS—Continued

State	Qualifications of director		Qualifications of other staff		Medical examination required—	
	Minimum age	Education and experience	Minimum age	Education and experience	Initially	Annually
Indiana	21	In centers licensed for more than 30 children—4 years college including courses in early childhood education or related area plus 1 year experience, *or* combination of education and experience which yields the equivalent. In centers licensed for 30 or less children—2 years college including courses in early childhood education or related plus 1 year experience, *or* work experience or combination of education and experience which yields the equivalent. Demonstrated administrative ability.[17]	[18] 18	Head teacher—Centers for more than 30 children—2 years college with courses in early childhood education or related area plus 1 year experience, or work experience or combination of education and experience which yields the equivalent. Head teacher—Centers for 30 or less—High school plus qualifying work experience. Teacher—All centers—High school or equivalent plus present enrollment in approved child care course, or work experience as part of approved 2-year course of study in child care, or 1 year experience as child care worker in licensed center or other bona fide preschool educational facility. Child care worker—Ability to read, write and count. Infant-toddler personnel—May substitute completed RN or LPN training and experience in nursery or pediatrics ward of licensed hospital for education and experience set forth for staff caring for older children.	×	×

Iowa	16	Equipped for work required	16	Equipped for work required[19]	X	(20)
Kansas	18	In centers licensed for 10 or less children under 6 years (or 12, 4 and 5 year olds, part-day)—6 months teaching experience, or 5 approved observation sessions in approved center plus attendance at either 1 approved workshop and 1 state-wide professional meeting or 1 2-day workshop, or 3 semester hours academic study or equivalent training course in child development plus either supervised student observations or 3 months work experience. Eleven to 20 children under 6 (or 24, 4 and 5, part-day)—5 observation sessions plus 1 year experience, or 7 semester hours or equivalent training courses plus student teaching or work experience. Over 20 children (or over 24, 4 and 5, part-day)—12 semester hours or equivalent training courses plus 3 years experience, or associate's degree or 2 year certificate in child development plus 2 years experience, or bachelor's degree in child development, or bachelor's degree in related area plus 12 hours or equivalent training in child development plus student teaching or 6 months work experience.	[21] 13	Teacher—Same as for director of center for 10 or less or 11 to 20. Assistant teacher—High school or college study in child development or equivalent training courses. Teacher—Infant/toddler—Same as for director of center for 10 or less, or L.P.N. degree plus 6 months experience in pediatrics or in center serving infants/toddlers. Teacher—School age children—Same as for director of any center, or bachelor's degree. Teacher—Developmentally disabled children—Same as for director of any center or for infant/toddler teacher plus academic work or equivalent training courses relevant to program development for the disabled child plus not be parent of any child enrolled in the unit to which assigned. Consultant—Developmentally disabled—Professional requirements of specialized service to be rendered.	X	X [22]
Kentucky		Equipped for work required		Equipped for work required	X	(3)
Louisiana		High school preferred		High school preferred	X	X

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 44.—QUALIFICATIONS OF CHILD CARE CENTER STAFF REQUIRED UNDER STATE LICENSING REGULATIONS—Continued

State	Qualifications of director		Qualifications of other staff		Medical examination required—	
	Minimum age	Education and experience	Minimum age	Education and experience	Initially	Annually
Maine	21	2 years college plus course in early childhood development (or employ staff member so qualified). If employed before March 1, 1969, high school or equivalent plus 6 months experience plus course or workshop in early childhood development.	....	Teacher and assistant teacher—high school or equivalent.[23]	X	(3)
Maryland	21	Centers licensed for 40 or more children—College graduation with specialization in early childhood development or related plus 2 years pre-primary teaching experience plus demonstrated ability to work with parents and other adults in community, or college graduation, plus teaching experience plus 64 hours in early childhood education plus demonstrated ability to work with parents and other adults in community plus intent to continue training.	[8] 21	Senior staff—High school or equivalent plus 64 hours early childhood education plus intent to continue training.	X	(3)

00142

	Centers for 21 to 40—2 years college plus 64 hours in early childhood education plus intent to continue training. Centers for 5 to 20—high school or equivalent plus 64 hours early childhood education plus intent to continue training. If employed prior to promulgation of regulations, must meet requirements for "5–20" within 3 years (1974).				
Massachusetts	High school or equivalent plus 3 years experience plus 4 courses in early childhood education, or 1 year of college plus 2 years experience plus 1 course in early childhood education. If employed before Sept. 21, 1972 and meets neither of above qualifications, must complete 1 approved course in child development within 2 years (Sept. 1974).	[24] 16	High school or equivalent plus either degree with major in early childhood or 1 course in child development plus plan for continuing study.	×	(1)
Michigan	2 years college			×	(28)

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 44.—QUALIFICATIONS OF CHILD CARE CENTER STAFF REQUIRED UNDER STATE LICENSING REGULATIONS—Continued

State	Qualifications of director		Qualifications of other staff		Medical examination required—	
	Minimum age	Education and experience	Minimum age	Education and experience	Initially	Annually
Minnesota	18	Administrative and supervisory experience or capability; teacher qualifications, if also teaching.	[24] 15	Teacher—Post secondary certificate in Child Development Assistant Training Program (minimum of 1080 hours) plus 1 year as assistant teacher plus 1 approved child development training course, *or* 2 years as assistant teacher plus 3 child development training courses, or bachelor's degree from accredited institution with 6 child development courses plus infant/toddler or school-age program experience, *or* degree in child development or nursery education from accredited institution plus infant/toddler program experience (if caring for this age group), *or* State nursery education certification plus experience (if caring for infant/toddlers), *or* compliance with OCD Child Development Associate competency level requirements. Teacher—Infant/Toddler only—3 years as licensed family or group family day care provider plus 3 child development courses. Teacher—School-Age only—State elementary or secondary education certication.	×	([25])

				Assistant teacher—Postsecondary certificate in CDAT Program plus infant/toddler program experience (if caring for this group), *or* 6 months as child care assistant or student teacher plus 3 approved child development courses, or 2 years post-secondary education plus 3 approved child development courses plus experience (if caring for infant/toddler group). Assistant teacher—Infant/Toddler only—6 months infant/toddler experience as licensed family day care provider plus 3 approved child development courses. Assistant teacher—School-Age only—1 year experience as teacher's aide, playground leader or in related area. Child care assistant (Aide)—High school vocational child care training course, or orientation training course in center.		
Mississippi					(26)	
Missouri		60 hours college, including courses in education or related fields. 2 years experience may be substituted for 1 year education.	18	Equipped by education, training, and experience.	X	X
Montana		Appropriately qualified		Appropriately qualified	X	
Nebraska	20	2 years college credit in child development or related area, *or* high school or equivalent plus attendance at approved training program within 2 years preceding application and every year thereafter.	[2] 20	Agreement to participate in training program within first year of employment and every year thereafter.	X	X

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 44.—QUALIFICATIONS OF CHILD CARE CENTER STAFF REQUIRED UNDER STATE LICENSING REGULATIONS—Continued

State	Qualifications of director		Qualifications of other staff		Medical examination required—	
	Minimum age	Education and experience	Minimum age	Education and experience	Initially	Annually
Nevada	21	2 years training or 2 years experience	18	Professional training in early childhood development and education desirable.	X	[27]
New Hampshire [1]	21	High school or equivalent	[6] 21	Teacher—High school or equivalent	X	X
New Jersey		Professional knowledge training and experience in education, child psychology or social work. Qualifications of head teacher, if responsible for educational program.		Head teacher—New Jersey nursery school certificate plus 2 years nursery teaching experience, or New Jersey teacher's certificate with nursery school endorsement plus 2 years experience under qualified nursery teacher. Group teacher—2 years college, 15 credits in nursery curriculum and child development plus 1 year experience, or 15 credits in early childhood development and enrolled in college plus 2 years experience. Assistant—High school or secondary school graduate, or parent.	X	X
New Mexico		Equipped for work required		Equipped for work required	X	X
New York [28]	[29] 21	College graduate with major in early childhood education.[29]	[30] 21	Group head—High school plus experience. Group head for infants under 18 months—Same, or formal training in infant care or experience with authorized child care agency.	X	X
North Carolina	21	Literate	[31] 16		X	X

00146

North Dakota		High school			×	×
Ohio [32]		2 years college with child development courses, or 2 years experience plus high school.		High school or completion of child care training program.	×	×
Oklahoma		High school, or equivalent education and experience.		High school, or equivalent education and experience.	(33)	(33)
Oregon	21	Centers for over 30 children—3 years college with emphasis on child development or related, or 3 years experience. Thirty or less children—2 years college with emphasis on child development or related, or 2 years experience.	[34] 15	Head teacher—Centers for over 30 children—2 years college with emphasis on child development or related, or 2 years experience. Head teacher—30 or less children—High school or equivalent, or 1 year experience. Teacher—All centers—High school or equivalent, or 1 year experience. Other professional staff—All centers—Appropriate State licensing requirements.	×	×
Pennsylvania	21	2 years college with 12 credits in child development, *or* 2 years junior college with major in child development.		Group supervisor—Pre-school—High school plus 1 year experience plus college credits or equivalent acceptable training in early childhood education. Group supervisor—School age—High school plus 1 year experience plus college or equivalent training in elementary education plus ability, interest and experience in arts and crafts, music or recreational skills. Assistant group supervisor—High school, or 2 years experience as center aide. Aide—Six years education plus 2 years experience, or combination of training and experience, or completion of approved training program.	×	×

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 44.—QUALIFICATIONS OF CHILD CARE CENTER STAFF REQUIRED UNDER STATE LICENSING REGULATIONS—Continued

State	Qualifications of director		Qualifications of other staff		Medical examination required—	
	Minimum age	Education and experience	Minimum age	Education and experience	Initially	Annually
Rhode Island		Experience in administration, professional preparation in appropriate field.		Head teacher—Bachelor's degree preferably with major in early childhood education, or combined education and experience. Assistant teacher—High school plus 2 years higher education or equivalent life experiences. Social worker—Bachelor's degree with major in sociology or related, preferably with social work experience.	×	×
South Carolina		Equipped for work required	[34] 21	Equipped for work required	×	×
South Dakota	21	High school or equivalent, plus 3 years experience.	[35] 21	Supervisor—High school or equivalent, or bachelor's degree in early childhood education or related, or 3 years experience in center which meets South Dakota licensing standards. Assistant—Completion of 1 child care training course, or 1 year experience.	×	×

00148

Tennessee		High school or equivalent plus 2 years experience, or college graduation.	[36] 18	Teacher—High school or equivalent Aide—Ability to read and write.	([33])	([33])
Texas		High school or equivalent, or acquisition of equivalency certificate in 3 years.		Equipped for work required	×	×
Utah		Reasonable knowledge of child growth and development.		Reasonable knowledge of child growth and development.	×	×
Vermont	18	1 year experience, or satisfactory combination of training and experience.	[36] 18	Formal training and/or work experience	×	×
Virginia		15 college credits		High school	×	×
Washington	21	College graduate with child development or related major, or 3 years experience.	[37] 18	Equipped for work required	([3])	([3])
West Virginia	21	High school	[38] 18	Equipped for work required	×	×
Wisconsin	21	High school or equivalent plus 1 approved course in child development and, if 9 or more children enrolled, 2 years higher education with 1 course in child development, or approved in-service training course plus 1 course in child development.	18	Completion of child care course, or, if parent on staff of parent co-op, 4 hours training, or, if nursery school teacher, possession of Wisconsin nursery teaching certificate or evidence of meeting qualifications for same.	×	×

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 44.—QUALIFICATIONS OF CHILD CARE CENTER STAFF REQUIRED UNDER STATE LICENSING REGULATIONS—Continued

State	Qualifications of director		Qualifications of other staff		Medical examination required—	
	Minimum age	Education and experience	Minimum age	Education and experience	Initially	Annually
Wyoming [1]	....	Equipped for work required. Training in early childhood education or related area suggested (if no other staff member so trained).	....	Training in early childhood education or related area suggested for at least 1 staff member.	X	X
HEW Recommended Guides for Day Care Licensing.	([39])	Necessary day care facility management skills plus ability to effectively relate to parents and community plus ability and willingness to provide child care program which meets standards set forth in "Guides."	18	Caregiver—Ability to read and write plus qualifications or experience to carry out a program emphasizing child development. If 30 or more children enrolled, at least one staff member in the facility at least 50% of the time the center is open must have Bachelor or Associate Arts degree plus 12 semester hours in child development or related field, or high school or equivalent plus 3 years experience, or Child Development Associate certification or similar status where a local, State or Federal certification program exists.	X	([40])

---

[1] Applicable to staff in centers caring for children 2½ and over; in Arkansas, 3 and over; in California, 2 and over; in New Hampshire, 3 and over; in Wyoming, 2 and over.

[2] 16, if under adult supervision.

[3] TB exam required annually; in Massachusetts, every 3 years; in Washington, every 2 years.

[4] If not under adult supervision.

[5] Every 6 months, if over 65.

[6] 16 for aides.

[7] If high school graduate without training in early childhood development, must employ educational consultant.

[8] Teachers and persons in charge of infant groups; 14 for aides; 16 for other infant staff.

[9] Annual health certificate required; annual exam recommended.

[10] Annual blood test and TB exam; annual physical for facility operators.

[11] At least 1 person 21 or over must be present in center during hours of service.

[12] No person under 18 shall assume sole responsibility for children.

[13] At least 1 regular staff member between 18 and 65.

[14] May be required.

[15] Child care workers; 18 for assistants; 14 for student helpers.

[16] Every 2 years.

[17] If director serves in capacity of administrative executive only, he need not meet education and experience requirements relating to early childhood education but must hire head teacher who does.

[18] Personnel having responsibility for a group of children; however, personnel in charge of infant/toddler group must be 21.

[19] If the nursery is licensed as a "school" there must be 1 teacher who is a high school graduate and has college credits.

[20] Every 3 years.

[21] 16 for assistant teachers.

[22] If over 65 or has health problem; otherwise, every 3 years.

[23] If kindergarten program provided, must be staffed by certified teacher.

[24] Aides.

[25] Every 2 years; annual TB exam.

[26] Staff records must include current health card issued or approved by local county health department.

[27] Every 2 years with serology; annual TB exam.

[28] Age, education, experience data applicable to centers receiving public funds.

[29] If also responsible for daily program activities.

[30] Group heads and group assistants who are not qualified by academic degree or teaching certificate; 17 for aides; 18 for infant group assistants.

[31] If supervising children.

[32] Applicable to full-time facilities.

[33] Physical exam recommended; TB exam required.

[34] Limited number may be between 18 and 21.

[35] Supervisors; 18 for assistants; 14 for student helpers.

[36] Younger aides may be used but cannot be counted in adult-child ratio.

[37] 16, if part-time and under adult supervision.

[38] Full-time staff; part-time aides with work permits may be younger.

[39] Locally applicable legal age of majority.

[40] Annual health status review required, TB exam recommended.

Note: Current as of Mar. 15, 1974.

TABLE 45.—FACILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR CHILD CARE CENTERS OFFERING FULL-DAY GROUP CARE UNDER STATE LICENSING REGULATIONS[1]

State	Minimum required square feet of space per child		Provisions concerning indoor space				Fencing of outdoor space	Must hot food be served?
	Indoor	Outdoor	Only floors generally permitted	Isolation room required	Isolation area required	Individual cot, etc. for naps required[2]		
Alabama[3]	35	60	Ground; 1st	X		X	Required if hazardous	Yes.
Alaska	30		Ground or above	X		X	Required	No.
Arizona	35	75	Below 2d		X	X[4]	do	Yes.[5]
Arkansas[3]	35	75			X	X	(Closed)	No.
California[3]	35	75			X	X	Required	No.
Colorado[3]	[6] 30	[7] 75	Floor of egress for children below third grade school level.		X	X	(Fenced or natural barrier.)	No.
Connecticut	30	75			X	X	(Adequately protected)	No.
Delaware	35		Areas having 2 exits to ground level; ground for infants.		X	X		No.
District of Columbia	[8] 35	[8] 60	No room more than ½ below ground level.	X *or*	X	X		No.

00152

Florida	25	40		X or	X	X	Required	No.
Georgia	35	[9] 100	No room more than 3 feet below ground level on all sides.		X	X	(Fenced or protected)	No.
Hawaii	35	75			X	X	do	No.
Idaho	25	[10] 75	Ground	X		X		No.
Illinois	[11] 35	[9] 75	Ground recommended		X	X	(Enclosed or protected)	Yes.
Indiana	[12] 35	50	Ground	X		X	do	No.
Iowa				X		X	Required if hazardous	No.
Kansas	[13] 35	[14] 100	Ground for children under 2½ and non-ambulatory physically handicapped children.		([15])		Required	No.
Kentucky	35		Not above 1st		X	X	Required if necessary	No.
Louisiana	35	[9] 75			X	X [16]	(Enclosed)	Yes.
Maine	20	75		X		X	Required	Yes.
Maryland	35		Not basement room entirely below ground level.		X	X	Required if necessary	No.
Massachusetts	35	[9] 75		X		X	Required if hazardous	No.
Michigan	35	[8] 75	Not above 2d unless building fireproof.	X		X	(Adequately protected)	No.
Minnesota	35	[17] 75			([18])	X [4]	(Enclosed if necessary)	No.
Mississippi	35	70	Ground or 1st desirable		X	X	(Barrier)	No.
Missouri	35	[9] 75			X	X	Required	No.
Montana	35	100	Ground; 1st	X		X [4]	Required if hazardous	Yes.
Nebraska	35	[8] 72	Ground preferred		X	X	Required for preschool children.	Yes.
Nevada	35	75	Ground		X	X	Required	No.

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 45.—FACILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR CHILD CARE CENTERS OFFERING FULL-DAY GROUP CARE UNDER STATE LICENSING REGULATIONS [1]—Continued

State	Minimum required square feet of space per child		Provisions concerning indoor space				Fencing of outdoor space	Must hot food be served?
	Indoor	Outdoor	Only floors generally permitted	Isolation room required	Isolation area required	Individual cot, etc. for naps required [2]		
New Hampshire [3]	30	[9] 75	Below 3d	X	....	X	Required if hazardous	No.
New Jersey	30	100	1st	X	....	X	(Fenced or protected)	Yes.
New Mexico	35	[9] 60	No room below grade unless 1 of 2 required exits opens directly to outside.	X	....	X	Required	No.
New York	35	....	Floors with readily accessible alternative exits.	X *or*	X	X	....	Yes.
North Carolina	25	75	....	....	....	X	(Fenced or protected)	No.
North Dakota	35	[9] 75	Ground preferred for preschool children.	....	X	X	Required if hazardous	Yes.
Ohio	35	[19] 60	1st for infants	....	X	X	(Fenced or protected)	No.
Oklahoma	35	75	Ground; 1st	X *or*	X	X	Required	No.
Oregon	35	....	Floors with 2 usable exits	X	....	X	do	No.
Pennsylvania	35	[20] 65	Ground or above	X *or*	X	X	(Fenced or protected)	No.
Rhode Island	35	75	Ground	....	X	X	Required	Yes.[21]
South Carolina	35	75	Not above 2d; not more than 3 feet below ground level.	X	....	X	do	No.
South Dakota	35	50	....	....	(22)	X	Required if on street	No.

Tennessee	30	50			(22)	X	Required	No.
Texas	35	[9] 80			(22)	X	(Fence or outer wall of building.)	Yes.
Utah	50	100	1st preferred		X	X	Required	No.
Vermont	35	75		X		X [5]	(Protected)	No.
Virginia	20			X		X		Yes.
Washington	35	75	Not above 1st story above grade.	X *or*	X	X		No.
West Virginia	35	100	1st preferred		(22)	X	(Fenced or nonclimbable wall.)	Yes.
Wisconsin	35	[9] 75	Floors having 2 exits to ground level.		(22)	X	(Enclosed)	No.
Wyoming [3]	35	75	Ground				(Fenced or enclosed)	No.
HEW Recommended Guides for Day Care Licensing	[23] 35	75	1st through 4th, conditioned upon type of building construction and age of children.			(24)	(Fenced or natural barrier.)	No.

---

[1] In addition to State and local fire, health, zoning, safety, and sanitation requirements.

[2] States checked in this column generally require a cot only when a child is of preschool age or receives at least 4 hours of care during the day.

[3] Applicable to facilities caring for other than infants/toddlers; in California, other than infants under 2.

[4] Rugs acceptable for children in care less than 5 hours.

[5] If provided by facility.

[6] 25 square feet per child permitted for centers in operation prior to January 1, 1966 and which continue in operation under the same governing body.

[7] For ⅓ the licensed capacity, or 1500 square feet in total, whichever is greater.

[8] Recommended or desirable.

[9] Per child per group occupying space at one time.

[10] 100 square feet for each child 6 or over.

[11] 25 square feet for each child under 2.

[12] If cribs used for toddlers, crib space must in addition to the required 35 square feet of indoor space per child.

[13] 50 for each disabled child using walker or wheel chair.

[14] Per child using space at one time; 75 square feet for each child under 2½.

[15] Quiet area required, if care of sick children provided.

[16] Individual cribs for infants; double beds (2 children per bed) may be used in lieu of cots for other children.

[17] And no less than 1,000 square feet per program.

[18] Provision for separation of sick child.

[19] For each preschool and school age child using at one time.

[20] Total space must accommodate ½ established center capacity but in no case be less than 650 square feet.

[21] Noon meals must be . . . usually hot.

[22] Isolation of ill child required.

[23] Limited indoor space offset by sheltered outdoor space under certain conditions.

[24] If space limited, individual floor pads permissible for infants, provided that certain safety conditions met.

Note: Current as of Mar. 15, 1974.

TABLE 46.—STATE LICENSING REGULATIONS CONCERNING FAMILY DAY CARE HOMES

State	Maximum number of children [1]	Maximum number of children under age 2	Staff qualifications		Facility requirements [3]	
			Medical examination required	Other [2]	Indoor requirements	Outdoor requirements
Alabama	[4] 5		Twice a year (recommended).		Individual cots; isolation area if more than 1 child in care recommended.	
Alaska	6		Annually incl. TB exam.	21 years old	Individual cots	
Arizona [5]			Initial TB and serological exams.	18 to 65 years old	Individual cots recommended.	Protected; fence preferred.
Arkansas	[6] 6	2	Annually; every 6 mos. if over 65 years.	21 to 65 years old, with exceptions.	35 square feet per child; baby bed for each child under 18 months.	Fenced if necessary.
California	[6] 5	[7] 2	Annual TB exam.		Individual cots; isolation of sick child.	
Colorado	6	2	Annually		35 square feet per child	75 square feet per child; fenced.[8]
Connecticut	[6] 4	[7] 2	Initially		Provision for rest period	
Delaware	6	[9] 3	do			
District of Columbia			Annually (recommended).		Individual cots; provision for isolation of sick child.	Enclosed yard, or proximity to park or playground.
Florida (Dade, Duval, Orange Counties only).	5	5	TB and blood tests annually; annual physicals for operators over 65 years.	21 years old (18 if approved).	25 square feet per child; individual cost or beds; isolation area or room.	40 square feet per child; fenced.
Georgia	6	([10])	Annually; TB exam.		35 square feet per child; provision for naps.	100 square feet per child in group using area; fenced or protected.

Hawaii	5	[7] 2	Initially, with TB exam annually.		35 square feet per child; individual cots; isolation of sick child.	Fenced or protected; well drained.
Idaho	6	[7] 2	May be required.		35 square feet per child; individual cots; provision for isolation of sick child.	75 square feet per child, under 6; 100 square feet per child 6 or over; fenced if hazardous.
Illinois	[11] 8	([11])	Initially		Individual cots; provision for isolation of sick child.	Protected play area.
Indiana	[12] 10		do		If over 6 children; 35 square feet per child; isolation room.	If over 6 children: 50 square feet per child; enclosed.
Iowa	5		do			
Kansas	[6] 4	2	Initially and every 3 years; annually if over 60 years. Initial TB exam.	Between 18 and 65 years old.	Napping facilities on 1st or 2nd floor, individual pads or cots, or no more than 2 children per double bed.	Fenced if hazardous.
Kentucky [13]	6		Initially; annual TB test, initial VD test.	Willingness to attend workshop and training courses.	35 square feet per child; individual cots; provision for isolation of sick child.	Fenced if necessary.
Louisiana [5]	6		Annually		Provision for naps; hot meal.	
Maine [13]	[6] 5	2	Annually with TB, VD, and typhoid tests.	18 years old	Individual cots; isolation of sick child; hot meal.	
Maryland	[4] 4		Initially	21 to 69 years old	Napping facilities	
Massachusetts	6		Annually	21 years old	Individual cots; isolation of sick child.	
Michigan	6	([14])		Not more than 65 years old.	40 square feet per child in sleeping room; isolation of sick child.	Fenced if necessary.

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 46.—STATE LICENSING REGULATIONS CONCERNING FAMILY DAY CARE HOMES—Continued

State	Maximum number of children [1]	Maximum number of children under age 2	Staff qualifications		Facility requirements [3]	
			Medical examination required	Other [2]	Indoor requirements	Outdoor requirements
Minnesota	[4] 5	(8)	Initially, with TB exam.	18 years old	Plan for isolation of sick child.	Enclosed as necessary.
Mississippi [5]	[4] 5	2	Initially		Provision for naps; isolation arrangements.	Protection from hazards.
Missouri [13]	[4] 6	2	Annually with TB exam.		Individual cots for preschool children and individual cribs for infants; isolation of sick child.	Fenced when necessary.
Montana [13]	6	2			Provision for naps; isolation room.	Fenced if hazardous.
Nebraska [13]	7	2	Annually with TB exam.	20 to 65 years old	35 square feet per child; hot meal for each child in care 4 hours or more; individual cots; isolation of sick child.	72 square feet per child desirable; fenced, if children 18 months to 5 years.
Nevada [15]						
New Hampshire	6	[7] 1	Annually	21 to 65 years old	Individual cots for each child remaining over 3 hours; plan for isolation of sick child.	
New Jersey [5]	5	[14] 2	Initially		Individual cots and cribs	
New Mexico	6	[16] 2			Individual crib for each child under 2 years.	Fenced if necessary.
New York [13]	[4] 5	2	Initially with TB exam.	Training or demonstrated interest in and ability to care for children.[17]	Rooms above ground level; individual cots; isolation area; hot meal for each child in care over 4 hours.	
North Carolina [18]	5					

North Dakota	[6] 5	[7] 2	Annually		35 square feet per child; individual cots recommended; isolation area suggested.	75 square feet per child; fenced if hazardous.
Ohio [5]	[6] 5	2	Initially with TB exam.	21 years old; training or experience in caring for children.	Approximately 35 square feet per child; provision for naps; isolation area.	
Oklahoma	5		Initially		Individual cots	
Oregon [13]	[19] 5	2	Initial TB exam.	21 years old	Individual cots or beds; isolation room suggested; warm food suggested.	Fenced if necessary.
Pennsylvania [13]	[6] 5	2	Annually with TB exam.	do	Rooms at ground level or above; individual cots, beds or cribs for children under 6 years; adequate room for temporary isolation, if more than 1 child in care.	Fenced or otherwise protected if toddlers in care.
Rhode Island	[20] 4	2	Annual TB exam.	21 to 60 years old; ability to speak English recommended.	Individual cribs for babies; isolation facilities.	Fenced if toddlers in care.
South Carolina	7	[21] 2	Annually		35 square feet per child; individual cot, bed or pad for each preschool child in care over 3 hours; provision for isolation of sick child if more than 1 child in care.	75 square feet per child; fenced if hazardous.
South Dakota	6	2	Initially	21 years old	Individual cots or mats recommended; isolation of sick child recommended; warm meal for each child in care over 4 hours.	Fencing desirable.

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 46.—STATE LICENSING REGULATIONS CONCERNING FAMILY DAY CARE HOMES—Continued

State	Maximum number of children [1]	Maximum number of children under age 2	Staff qualifications		Facility requirements [3]	
			Medical examination required	Other [2]	Indoor requirements	Outdoor requirements
Tennessee [13]	7	([22])	Annual TB exam.	([23])		Protected if hazardous.
Texas	6	[16] 2	Annually	21 to 65 years old recommended.	500 cubic feet per child; individual cots; isolation of sick child.	Fenced.
Utah [13]	6		do		Individual cots recommended; provision for isolation of sick child recommended.	
Vermont	6	[24] 2	Annually with TB exam.	18 years old; formal training and/or work experience.	35 square feet per child; individual cots recommended; isolation room.	75 square feet per child; protected.
Virginia [13]	[4] 9	([25])	Initially		Separate beds for other than brothers or sisters of the same sex; provision for isolation of sick child.	
Washington	[6] 6	2	May be required.		Individual cots; isolation of sick child.	Fenced if necessary.
West Virginia	6	2	Initial TB exam.	18 to 65 years old recommended.	Provision for naps	
Wisconsin [15]						
Wyoming [13]	[26] 5	[27] 2	Annually		35 square feet per child	75 square feet per child; fenced or enclosed.

HEW Recommended Guides for Day Care Licensing.	[28] 6	2	Initially with TB exam; annual health status review; annual TB exam recommended.	Locally applicable age of legal majority; day care facility management skills; ability to relate effectively to parents and community, ability and willingness to provide child care program in accord with "Guides'" standards.	35 square feet per child, or usable outdoor space for activities normally conducted indoors to offset limited indoor space.	75 square feet per child; fenced or natural barrier.

---

[1] Including the operator's own children.

[2] Excludes generally stated requirements concerning maturity, suitability, good character, etc.

[3] In addition to State and local fire, health, zoning, safety, and sanitation requirements; this table omits requirements that "safe" or "adequate" indoor or outdoor space be available.

[4] Excluding operator's own children.

[5] Certification or approval; licensing not mandatory.

[6] Arkansas—16, if all children 3 or over, an adult helper present, facility approved by State Health Department. California—6, if none under 3. Connecticut—6, if 5 or more related. Maximum number of children for which facility is licensed as "based upon" rather than "inclusive of" operator's own children. Kansas—6, if all over 2. Maine—6, if all 2½ or over. Minnesota—4, if more than 2 under 16 mos. In addition to licensed capacity, 2 school age children may be accepted for care if care limited to no more than 3 hours per day no more than 30 days per school year. Mississippi—12, if children 3 to 14 and staff-child ratio of at least 1:6. New York—6, if none under 3. North Dakota—6, if children 3 to 8, or if helper present. Ohio—6, if children 3 to 14. Pennsylvania—6, if children between 3 and 16. Washington—10, if none under 2, and at least 1 half-time assistant present.

[7] California—4, with assistant. Connecticut—4, if full-time adult assistant present. Hawaii—4, with additional adult help. Idaho—4, with additional adult help. New Hampshire—3, if not more than 4 children in care. North Dakota—6, if helper present.

[8] Required if children between 12 months and 5 years.

[9] No more than 3 infants shall be cared for by 1 person.

[10] Helper required if there are 3 children under 2½ in addition to older children.

[11] Assistant required if: more than 4 under 6; total of 4, 2 or more of whom are under 2 or handicapped; total of 5 or more under 6, 2 or more of whom are under 2 or handicapped.

[12] 6, if no additional staff.

[13] License not required if numbers of children in care are: Kentucky—less than 4; Maine—less than 3; Missouri—less than 5; Montana—less than 3; Nebraska—less than 2; New York—less than 3; Oregon—less than 5; Pennsylvania—less than 3; Tennessee—less than 5; Utah—less than 3 (unless caring for State placed or financed children); Virginia—less than 4. Wyoming—less than 3.

[14] No more than 2 under 1.

[15] Homes not licensed.

[16] If 2 under 2, not more than 1 additional child under 6 may be admitted.

[17] No person under 18 may be left in sole charge of children.

[18] Homes subject to annual registration; licensing not required.

[19] Maximum of 4 day care children; total of 6, including own, if none under 3.

[20] Special license may permit care of up to 7.

[21] Preferred.

[22] If more than 4 under 3 attend full-time, second staff member required.

[23] Persons under 18 should not have responsibility for group of children unless assisted or supervised by person 18 or older; persons over 65 should not have responsibility for family day care home.

[24] Unless second person on duty.

[25] There must be 1 adult for every 3 children under 2 and for every 6, 2 or older.

[26] Excluding operator's first pre-school child.

[27] 1 preferred; if more than 3, additional staff suggested.

[28] Children under 3 limited to number that could be carried in case of necessity to evacuate building.

Note: Current as of Mar. 15, 1974.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

Excerpts From "Child Care Arrangements of Working Mothers in the United States"*

* * * * * * *

The Children and Arrangements for Their Care: An Overview

In February 1965 there were 12.3 million children under 14 years of age whose mothers had worked, either full or part time, for at least 6 months during the preceding year. This number represented one-fifth (22 percent) of all the Nation's children in this age range. On the average, working mothers had 2.0 children under 14 (1.9 for full-time, and 2.2 for part-time, working mothers). In addition, about one-third of the mothers had at least one child 14–17 years of age.

Mothers or other respondents were asked: "While (Mother) was working, who usually looked after (Child)?" The interviewers translated the answer into one of the codes in a precoded classification of arrangements, a classification that worked well, as indicated by the fact that the residual category ("other arrangements") was used only for one-half of 1 percent of the children. For children who were attending school part of the time while their mothers were working, the question referred to the time the children were not in school. A separate code was used for children whose mothers worked only during school hours and for whom no other care was provided.

The question on child care was asked separately for each child under 14 years of age, since mothers may make different arrangements for each child depending on age, school attendance, or other factors. As mothers may make more than one kind of arrangement for a given child during the course of a year, the question referred to the most recent month the mother worked. For a woman who was employed during the survey week, this was the month before the interview. For other women, the question referred to the last month they had worked. Since 83 percent of the mothers were employed at the time of the survey, the arrangement reported for the great majority of children was the one that was in effect in January 1965. If a mother made more than one arrangement during the month, the one in effect longest was selected.

A brief overview of the arrangements reported will serve as an introduction to a more extended analysis.

Nearly half of the 12.3 million children (5.6 million or 46 percent) were cared for in their own homes while their mothers were working. This most frequent type of child care consisted of care by the father—15 percent; care by a relative other than the father—21 percent; and care by a nonrelative—9 percent. Such care for a child does not mean that he must have remained within his own home all the time, but that the person responsible for his welfare could usually be found there while taking care of him.

---

*By Seth Low and Pearl G. Spindler, Children's Bureau Publication 461–1968.

Children cared for in their own homes by a relative other than the father (2.6 million children in all) included among their number 570,000 who were cared for by a relative under 16 years of age, presumably an older brother or sister, and 440,000 who were cared for by a relative 65 years of age or older, presumably grandparents. Many grandparents doubtless were included also in the age group under 65.

Children cared for in their own homes by nonrelatives numbered 1.2 million. Half of these nonrelatives served only to look after children; the other half were housekeepers or maids who usually had household duties in addition to looking after children.

Child care was provided in someone else's home (not the child's) for 1.9 million children (16 percent of the total). About half of these children were cared for by a relative and half by a nonrelative. Care in someone else's home by a nonrelative is termed "family day care" in this report.

Two types of arrangements, affecting substantial numbers of children, involved the mother herself. There were 1.6 million children (13 percent) who were looked after by the mother while she was working. Mothers who look after their own children may work in a family store, business, or farm, or, much less frequently, may take children to their place of work and look after them there. Another 1.8 million children (15 percent) had mothers who worked only during their children's school hours and required no special arrangements.

Rarest of all arrangements was group care of children in a day care center, nursery school, or like facility. Only 265,000 children (2 percent) were cared for in this way. To this number should be added approximately 81,000 children cared for in someone else's home by a nonrelative who cared for six or more children other than her own. These children, although cared for in a family home, are commonly considered to be in group care because of the large number of children supervised. Their inclusion brings the total in group care up to 346,000 (3 percent).

Nearly 1 million children (994,000 or 8 percent) looked after themselves while their mothers worked. Most of them attended school part of the time the mother was away but were expected to care for themselves the rest of the time. These children in self-care, often called "latch-key children" because they carry on their person a key to the home, were left on their own without supervision.

Child care arrangements usually covered all of the time the mother was away at work. There were 1.3 million children (11 percent), however, for whom the arrangement did not extend this long and for whom a supplementary arrangement covering the rest of the time was necessary. Supplementary arrangements were generally in the child's own home (four-fifths of such arrangements), the father typically being in charge. The children most likely to have a supplementary arrangement were those who were cared for in their own homes by a nonrelative who had no other domestic duties, and those who were in group care centers. More than a fourth of the children for whom such arrangements were made required supplementary care.

The predominant role of the family in providing child care while the mother worked is readily apparent. If all arrangements are combined in which children are cared for by themselves or by their immediate or extended family (mother, father, or other relative) 80 percent of the children are covered. The link to the child's home is present also for the 9 percent of the children who, although cared for by a nonrelative, were cared for in their own homes.

Care of children outside the home or family accordingly plays a relatively limited role at the present time. Only 10 percent of the children of working mothers (1.2 million children) were cared for in this way. This 10 percent consisted of 7 percent in family day care and 3 percent in group care.

Child care arrangements varied widely among different groups of mothers and children. Among the influential factors were the extent of the mother's employment, the child's age, color, the mother's marital status, her education and occupation, and the family income. The full meaning of the survey data can only be obtained by considering these variations.

* * * * * * *

CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS FOR CHILDREN OF MOTHERS WORKING FULL TIME, 1965

	Total		Children under 6		Children 6 to 13	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1. Total Number of Children	8,315,000	100.0	2,561,000	100.0	5,753,000	100.0
2. Cared for in own home by—						
(a) Father	1,145,000	13.8	264,000	10.3	881,000	15.3
(b) Other relative	2,013,000	24.2	472,000	18.4	1,520,000	26.4
(Under 16 years old)	(397,000)	(4.7)	(25,000)	(1.0)	(372,000)	(6.5)
(16 years and over)	(1,615,000)	(19.5)	(446,000)	(17.4)	(1,149,000)	(20.0)
(c) Nonrelative who only looked after children	429,000	5.2	238,000	9.3	188,000	3.3
(d) Nonrelative who usually did additional household chores	513,000	6.2	236,000	9.2	281,000	4.9
(e) Subtotal, children cared for in own home	4,099,000	49.3	1,209,000	47.2	2,871,000	49.9

3. Cared for in someone else's home by—						
(a) Relative	801,000	9.6	452,000	17.6	354,000	6.2
(b) Nonrelative	836,000	10.1	502,000	19.6	341,000	5.9
(c) Subtotal, children cared for in someone else's home	1,637,000	19.7	954,000	37.3	695,000	12.1
4. Other arrangements:						
(a) Care in group care center	239,000	2.9	197,000	7.7	41,000	.7
(b) Child looked after self	800,000	9.6	7,000	.3	794,000	13.8
(c) Mother looked after child while working	575,000	6.9	171,000	6.7	407,000	7.1
(d) Mother worked only during child's school hours	917,000	11.0	12,000	.5	906,000	15.7
(e) Other	50,000	.6	10,000	.4	40,000	.7

Source: Seth Low and Pearl G. Spindler, "Child Care Arrangements of Working Mothers in the United States," Children's Bureau Publication 461-1968, tables A-2 and A-3, page 71.

CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS: NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN OF FULL-TIME WORKING MOTHERS BY AMOUNT PAID, 1965

	Total number of children	No cost to mother	Less than $250 annually	$250 to $500 annually	More than $500 annually
Total number of children	8,315,000	6,140,000	461,000	865,000	849,000
Cared for in own home by:					
Member of family or relative	3,157,000	3,157,000			
Nonrelative who only looked after children	429,000	53,000	126,000	159,000	91,000
Nonrelative who usually did additional household chores	513,000	64,000	76,000	157,000	216,000
Subtotal	4,099,000	3,274,000	202,000	316,000	307,000
Cared for in someone else's home by:					
Relative	801,000	412,000	100,000	163,000	126,000
Nonrelative	836,900	99,000	133,000	318,000	286,000
Subtotal	1,637,000	511,000	233,000	481,000	412,000

Other arrangements:					
Care in group care center	239,000	22,000	27,000	66,000	124,000
Child looked after self	800,000	800,000			
Mother looked after child while working	575,000	575,000			
Mother worked only during child's school hours	917,000	917,000			
Other	50,000	41,000		2,000	7,000
Percentage distribution:					
Cared for in own home by:					
Nonrelative who only looked after children	100.0	12.3	29.3	37.0	21.4
Nonrelative who usually did additional household chores	100.0	12.6	14.8	30.7	42.0
Cared for in someone else's home by:					
Relative	100.0	51.4	12.5	20.4	15.7
Nonrelative	100.0	11.9	15.9	38.0	34.2
Care in group care center	100.0	9.1	11.3	27.7	51.9
Total, all children	100.0	73.9	5.5	10.4	10.2

Source: Seth Low and Pearl G. Spindler, *Child Care Arrangements of Working Mothers in the United States*, Children's Bureau Publication 461—1968, tables A-2, A-49, and A-50, pp. 71, 108.

APPENDIX B

Excerpts From Day Care Survey 1970: Summary Report and Basic Analysis, Presented to the Office of Economic Opportunity by the Westinghouse Learning Corporation, April 1971

* * * * * * *

II. Major Findings

A. Family Day Care Homes

Because day care usually brings to mind child care provided in some sort of day care center, the category of family day care homes is often overlooked completely.[16] Certainly much less attention has been paid to the kind of care provided in such homes or to the appropriateness of perhaps expanding this type of day care service. Yet the majority (55%) of all children in day care full-day are cared for in family day care homes.

More than half of the day care homes have white operators and are located in single family units situated in a residential, single family neighborhood. Three-fourths of the homes care for only one or two children on a full-day basis. More than one-fifth of the children in such homes are under 2 years of age.

Probably the single most striking statistic on day care homes is that less than 2 percent of the estimated 450,000 homes are licensed as compared with almost 90 percent of the centers. Some states do not require licensing if there are fewer than a certain number of children (usually three) being cared for. Nevertheless, this very small percentage of licensed homes seems to bear out the findings of the community studies that complicated, contradictory and often overly detailed and rigid requirements discourage licensing. Licensing agencies are often understaffed and have little opportunity to recruit day care mothers or to seek out homes which should be licensed.

---

[16] For this report family day care homes are those which care for not more than seven children, with at least one child being cared for seven or more hours per day, at least two days per week, for pay. This classification excludes foster homes providing 24-hour care.

Family day care homes, then, are generally unregulated and unsupervised by any governmental or social agency. Hundreds of thousands of children, including those whose fees are paid by government funds, are cared for in these homes, about which very little is known. This survey is the first attempt to assess the extent and describe the characteristics of day care homes.

B. Day Care Centers

About 575,000 children receive full-day care in day care centers. These centers are so heterogeneous that it is difficult, if not impossible, to generalize about their characteristics. Nevertheless, some of the more striking statistics give a profile of day care centers nationwide. An estimated 17,500 centers provide full-day care. Sixty percent of these centers are proprietary, and proprietary centers care for about half the children enrolled in centers. Among the various nonprofit organizations, churches provide the greatest number of facilities, about 18 percent of all centers, and United Fund agencies operate the oldest day care centers. Public schools operate day care centers for some 108,000 children, but they offer little in the way of "extended day" programs for the school-age children of working mothers. More than four times as many preschool as school-age children are in public school day care programs. Only 21,000 school-age children in about 350 schools are cared for after school or before and after school.

1. *Facilities*

Day care centers, for the most part, occupy houses, specially-constructed buildings, and churches; and they are located in residential neighborhoods. They are not, as yet, located in or near the workplace, except for hospital-sponsored facilities for nurses' children. Although no such centers were identified by the national survey, several were found in the six communities visited; and the Women's Bureau has identified about 150 hospital-affiliated day care centers.[17] It is impossible to tell from this survey whether workplace facilities would have appeal for mothers.

The amount of equipment for child use varies greatly from center to center, but most centers have some or all of the following kinds of equipment and playthings: indoor muscle development equipment such as blocks and trucks; quiet play equipment such as puzzles, art supplies, housekeeping toys, musical toys and instruments; educational materials such as workbooks; science equipment; audiovisual equipment; cots and cribs; and outdoor play apparatus. The estimated replacement value of this child-related equipment, on the average, is $55 per child. It should be understood that this figure does not include administrative and kitchen equipment and furniture, or maintenance equipment. At several large, well-equipped centers visited during the community studies task, the average *total* equipment cost per child was estimated at approximately $100.

2. *Day Care Programs*

Very little attempt was made in this survey to characterize the programs or activities carried out at the centers. It was felt that this kind of description could only be made on the basis of expert observation over time, an approach that was not part of the survey design. The interviewers were encouraged to comment on their impressions and observations of the centers they visited, however, and from their notes and the on-site observations of the community studies teams, some idea of fairly general practices can be developed. At last some attempt is made in many centers to teach children words, stories, songs, and skills such as managing their own clothes. Apparently most operators of day care centers believe that they should provide preschool education, although what this means and how it is carried out varies widely. In contrast, neither they nor the parents mentioned health services very frequently as a responsibility of day care centers.

---

[17] Women's Bureau, Department of Labor, *Child Care Services Provided by Hospitals*, 1970.

3. *Characteristics of Day Care Staff*

The people working in day care centers nationwide are, for the most part, neither well-educated nor well-paid. Most directors and teachers do not have college degrees and very few have had special training for day care work, e.g., courses in early childhood development. The median reported salary for both directors and teachers is less than $360 a month. There is not a great deal of experience among those presently employed in day care centers. Nearly a fourth of all staff members had less than a year's experience in group child care, and 51 percent of all staff have been working in day care less than three years. Women comprise almost the entire staff; only about 6 percent (including administrators and maintenance personnel) are men. Contrary to expectation, few day care personnel are volunteers. Less than 4 percent of the staff are volunteers and only 1 percent of them work full-time. Little use is made of teachers' aides. Perhaps this fact is related to the low status of day care teachers, most of whom have the education and salary level more often associated with paraprofessional than professional positions.

Estimates of average staff to child ratios nationwide are likely to be meaningless, partly because of the wide differences in individual center ratios and staffing patterns, and partly because of the great number of part-time personnel. Their schedules and number of working hours vary enormously, making any computation of their total contribution a complex process.

4. *Clientele of Day Care Centers*

Day care centers serve children from infancy through school-age. The largest age group in centers is the 4-year-old group. An estimated 24,000 children under 2 years old are enrolled in centers. While over half of all centers offer care of school-age children, only about 87,000 school children receive before and/or after school care in centers.

Centers serve a proportionately greater number of black than white children since 36 percent of the children in centers are black. As might be expected, black children tend to be in the larger centers, which are more frequently nonproprietary and located in large metropolitan areas.

A large number of centers (38%) do not permit sick children to attend, which means that working mothers whose children are enrolled in these centers must stay home from work or make other arrangements when their children have colds or other minor illnesses. Working mothers need day care centers which are equipped to care for slightly sick children.

5. *A Typology for Day Care Centers*

In the course of the community studies, it was observed that day care centers seemed to fall into three categories or types of facilities. Through procedure described in section 2.1, it was found that the centers in the national sample could also be categorized by these types. This typology should not be confused with levels of quality. It is based on aims of the program and descriptive elements without regard to whether these aims are being met, how well the elements are functioning, or what effect they have on the children and families being served. Good and bad Type A centers and good and bad Type C centers can be found.

Type A centers aim to provide what is generally known as "custodial" care, that kind of care which is necessary for maintaining the physical well-being and safety of the child but without any systematic attempt to educate him. Good custodial centers approximate good home care. They have small child to staff ratios, variety and sufficient quantity of equipment and playthings, adequate space, safe environments, warm and child-loving adults, daily routines, nutritious food, and happy children.

Type B centers may be identified as "educational" day care. They provide an adequate child care program but few if any related services. These centers usually have a curriculum and, for part of the day at least, they approximate a kindergarten; they have a regulated, school-like atmosphere. Good educational centers have trained personnel on the staff and intellectually stimulating environments, i.e., games and toys designed for specific learning objectives, musical instruments, art equipment, animals, plants, good books; and they keep progress records on the children.

Type C centers might be called "developmental" or "comprehensive" because they aim to provide everything necessary for the full development of the child's physical, mental, and social capabilities. Good developmental centers conform to the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements. (Although a large proportion of Type C centers are funded by the Federal Government, some centers of this type are proprietary.) A good developmental facility offers complete health care, social services to the family, parent education and involvement, in-service staff training, attention to the emotional and creative needs of children, and concern for community relations, in addition to adequate care and supervision.

No attempt was made in this study to evaluate day care centers, either in terms of their own objectives and clientele or against some external criteria. It is apparent from the overall statistics, from a review of operator questionnaires, and from the on-site observations in six communities, however, that many centers of each type fall short of the descriptions of good facilities. On the other hand, there are some examples of good centers in each category. Thus, it would be a mistake to equate Type C with good day care and Type A with bad or inadequate care.

6. *Unfilled Day Care Slots*

An estimated 63,000 unfilled day care slots evenly divided between proprietary and nonproprietary facilities were found in this survey. Many unfilled slots also were discovered during the community studies field visits. Normal turnover may account for some of the unfilled slots and the fees of proprietary centers may explain the underenrollment in centers of this type, but nonproprietary centers usually charge less and frequently base their fees, if any, on the parents' ability to pay. The community profiles showed that location may be a critical factor in underutilization of facilities. Centers that were not fully enrolled in these communities tended to be inaccessible to families that need them, and transportation to a day care center can be an insurmountable problem for a working mother.

7. *Characteristics of User Families*

Day care centers currently do tend to serve lower-income families as earlier studies have shown. The parents of children in the day care centers surveyed were estimated by center operators to have a median income of $7,500 which is $1,100 less than the median family income for all U.S. families in 1968. A disproportionate number of single parent families use center care: nearly one-third of the families using centers are families without the father present. Most user-mothers, regardless of the presence of a man in the household, are working.

Parents of children enrolled in day care centers expect the center to provide good food, education, training, and good care. Parents of children in centers categorized as B and C types cited education as an expected provision of day care centers more frequently than parents of children in Type A centers. Apparently either those parents who most value preschool education for their children choose centers which tend to provide this element, or they have come to value education because of their exposure to it in the centers where their children are enrolled. Given the limited choice available to parents because of the scarcity and cost of day care centers, it seems likely that the second condition is operating more frequently.

Most of the working mothers whose children are in centers seem to be satisfied with group care for their children: a majority of them want no change in their day care and of those who want better day care, most would prefer an improved center rather than another type of arrangement.

8. *Costs of Day Care*

The costs of day care centers are borne principally by parents and the Federal Government. Other sources of revenue include state and local governments and community organizations. Exactly how much is paid from which source is impossible to determine from the available data. According to the day care operators, over half the receipts come from parent fees, but an estimated 17 percent of these fees are actually paid in full or in part by welfare grants or manpower training allowances. Some Federal money channeled through state and local agencies may have been identified by respondents as local funds. As might be expected 99 percent of the income of proprietary centers is reported as parent fees, while multiple sources of support for nonproprietary centers is the rule rather than the exception.

Extreme caution must be exercised in interpreting cost data reported by day care centers. It is certain that complete costs have not been reported in many cases. No attempt was made to impute the value of donated goods and services or rent-free space. Moreover, the concept of a full-day equivalent child, used to compute costs per child, has some limitations because one actual full-day child requires more food, equipment, furniture and adult attention than two children, each of whom spends (typically) only two and a half to three hours at the center. Nevertheless, if these limitations are understood, some useful estimates of cost, particularly comparative costs of different types of centers, can be made. For example, the median cost per month for a full-day equivalent child is $27 in Type A centers, $45 in Type B centers, and $114 in Type C centers. Since cost frequently does not include proprietor's income and since Type A centers are predominately proprietary, the median cost per child of $27 or this type of center is understated.

C. Mothers: Day Care Arrangements and Participation in Work Force

In this part of the survey, mothers in families with incomes of less than $8,000 and a child age 9 or under were interviewed. The purpose of these interviews was to gather information that might provide answers to the following questions:

How many of these mothers are employed?

What arrangements do the working mothers make for the care of their children?

How much do these arrangements cost?

What are these mothers' preferences in child care?

To what extent does difficulty with child care affect the labor force participation of these mothers?

1. *Child Care Arrangements of Working Mothers*

Working mothers in the target population have 3.7 million children under 14 years of age, 1.6 million of whom are under six years old. Most of these children are cared for in their own homes and three-fourths of the mothers using in-home care said they were well satisfied with this arrangement. Of the 2 to 5 year-olds in out-of-home care, 29 percent are in day care centers, while 39 percent are in day care homes.

Although a smaller percentage of children are cared for in centers than in family day care homes, more of the mothers whose children are in centers are well satisfied with this arrangement. The least satisfactory types of arrangements, according to these working mothers, are those involving a sibling or non-relative caring for the child in the home or care in a family day care home.

The average cost for out-of-home care for seven or more hours a day is about $9.80 per week. Most in-home care is provided by a relative at no charge.

Working mothers whose children are cared for in a variety of arrangements most frequently cite good care, good food, and safety as the elements of child care they value or the provisions they expected. Only about a third of these mothers think that a day care facility should provide preschool education. (In contrast, mothers who are using centers are more likely to expect education as a provision of day care.)

2. *Child Care Preferences of Working and Nonworking Mothers*

As might be expected, care in the child's home is the type of arrangement that has greatest acceptability among mothers in the target population. It is used most frequently by working mothers and cited most frequently as their preference, if they went to work, by nonworking mothers. However, there are indications in this survey of significant interest in and desire for day care centers. Of working mothers who want better day care, about one-third would prefer care in a day care center. Nearly a third (29%) of the nonworking mothers said they would prefer care in a center, if they went to work.

Preference for day care centers over other types of arrangement is associated with race. Over half of the black mothers would like center care as compared with less than a fourth of the white mothers. As the center survey showed, black mothers have had somewhat more exposure to group day care than white mothers have. In addition, more blacks than whites have had Head Start experience. Whatever the reason, centers clearly have greater acceptance among black than white mothers.

Nonworking mothers have the same expectations of day care as working mothers have. Good food, good care, and safety have priority, with educational, social, and health provisions mentioned much less frequently.

The greatest number of working mothers in the target population (36%) stated that they would be willing to pay between $7 and $13 a week for their preference in child care for preschool children. The next largest group (16%) said they could not afford to pay anything. Over half these mothers would not be willing to pay for care of school-age children, but 28 percent said they would pay $3 to $7 a week for before- and after-school care.

3. *Relationship Between Day Care and Mothers' Employment Status*

According to the nonworking mothers who had children in day care centers,[18] availability of child care is only one of a number of complex and interrelated factors involved in a woman's choice regarding employment. Inability to find a job, cited about 13 percent of the time, may be related to the low educational level of user—mothers. No interest in working was claimed without explanation in a number of cases. Nearly half of these nonworking user-mothers gave such a variety of answers that they could not be categorized. The jobs that are open to women, the salaries offered, and the mother's education and training (or lack of it) all have bearing on whether or not a mother seeks a job outside the home. Her decision is also influenced by the kind of child care arrangements she feels are necessary, the kind of child care available to her, the effect of her absence on the household, the cost of going to work, and so on.

In the area sample only 16 percent of the nonworking mothers stated absolutely that they would not work, but more than 34 percent said they preferred to be home with their children and another 18 percent said they could not make (or afford) satisfactory child care arrangements. A number of other reasons for not working were given and those who had worked since having children gave a variety of reasons, not always child-related, for having stopped working.

Other studies have shown the correlation of education and employment for women.[19] The percent of mothers in the target population (less than $8,000 family income and child age 9 or under) who had completed twelve or more years of school is significantly less than the corresponding figure for the adult population nationwide. In addition, a smaller percentage of mothers in the target population is working than in the population of all mothers: 25 percent of the households surveyed have working mothers while 39 percent of all mothers with children under 17 and 30 percent of those with children under 6 are working.[20] Within the population surveyed, this correlation between education and employment is further demonstrated. The largest group of working mothers (15% of all mothers in the target population) has ten to twelve years of education. Very few of the mothers in the target population have more than a high school education, but a third of those who do are employed. A comparison between the educational levels of working and nonworking mothers in the survey also reinforces the significance of education: 80 percent of the working mothers have completed tenth grade or more, while only 69 percent of the nonworking mothers have had that much education.

---

[18] These mothers were surveyed in the "User Sample" and are not to be confused with parents surveyed in the "Area Sample."

[19] Including: Ruderman, Florence A. *Child Care and Working Mothers*, 1968; Seth Low and Pearl G. Spindler, *Child Care Arrangements of Working Mothers*, 1968.

[20] Bureau of Labor Statistics reported in Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., *Manpower Information Service*, Vol. 2, No. 12, Feb. 24, 1970.

Education apparently is a strong factor in determining whether or not a woman enters the labor force, but other factors also impinge. The presence of children is obviously a deterrent to women's work force participation, nevertheless a large number of working mothers (358,000) admitted that their child care arrangements were unsatisfactory. Yet they work. No one knows how many children of working mothers are left without adequate care and supervision. As this survey shows, many mothers take jobs regardless of the availability of acceptable child care arrangements.

The only conclusion possible is that there is no simple relationship between the availability of child care facilities and the employment of mothers. It seems unlikely that, if day care centers and homes were accessible to all mothers, the nonworking mothers would use them in order to take any job available to them. A woman might understandably prefer to stay at home with her children if she would have to pay for child care or accept an unsatisfactory arrangement in order to work at a menial, low-paid job. Of course, an unskilled, poorly educated woman might not have the choice of any job. If both acceptable jobs and suitable day care facilities were available, however, it would appear that many of the nonworking mothers would join the labor force.

In summary, then, most working mothers in the target population express satisfaction with their present child care arrangements. Of those who would prefer a change, about one-third would choose center care. The most frequent choice of nonworking mothers would be in-home care, followed by care in a center. Both working and nonworking mothers expect a day care program to provide good food, good care, and safety, while those mothers whose children are in centers that provide some kind of educational component also rank education high on the list of expected elements. To what extent the availability of various kinds of day care influences mothers' decisions to work has not been determined; however, the lack of adequate child care, as evaluated by the mother, may not be sufficient to prevent her from working as evidenced by the working mothers who are very dissatisfied with their present arrangements.

III. The Need for Day Care

Day care for young children in the United States today is an institution lagging far behind the social change that has brought about the need for it. It is an unorganized, largely unregulated, and unlicensed service, provided in ways that range from excellent to shockingly poor, and yet it is indispensable to a growing number of people in present-day America: the force of working women of child-bearing age. Working mothers represent all socioeconomic levels, and the family with a working mother is becoming the norm rather than the exception. In the absence of organized day care, ad hoc arrangements, which are largely impossible to assess in any accurate way, abound.

The following statistics illustrate the fact that very few of the Nation's children of working mothers are cared for in any organized way.

Children under age 6 with working mothers	*3, 800, 000
Children in day care centers and family day care homes full-day	1, 300, 000
In centers full-day	575, 000
In family day care homes full-day	712, 000
Children aged 6 to 14 with working mothers	*8, 500, 000
Children in before and/or after school care	233, 000
In public schools	21, 000
In day care centers	87, 000
In family day care homes	125, 000

*Bureau of the Census Current Population Survey, 1965. (This is the most recent statistic available.)

Even these facilities are, for the most part, unregulated. Ninety-eight percent of the homes are unlicensed, and although 90 percent of the centers are licensed, it would be a mistake to assume that possession of a license assures compliance to state and local regulations.

In the six communities studied it was found that licensing agencies have neither the authority, the staff, nor the funds to enforce the standards.

The need for day care among low- and moderate-income families was of particular concern in the survey reported here. The following statistics highlight the findings of this survey.

- —358,000 low- and moderate-income working mothers are very dissatisfied with their present arrangements for child care.
- —An estimated three-quarters of a million low- and moderate-income mothers are not working because they cannot find satisfactory child care.
- —The cost per child for full-day care in a day care center is approximately $56 per month.[21] Low- and moderate-income working mothers who pay for child care presently pay an average of about $35 per child per month.
- —373,000 low- and moderate-income working mothers with preschool children say that they would prefer care in a day care center for their children.

Based on these statistics, various estimates of the extent of this need can be made. While it is not the intent of this report to make recommendations to the government, some of the findings raise questions relating to the definition of "need for day care" that should be considered. Day care facilities are needed, not only for the children of poor mothers who want to work, but also for the children of already working mothers who are unable to arrange for adequate child care. There are more than one and a half million preschool children in families with incomes of less than $8,000 whose mothers are working. Information about the arrangements made for their care is included in this report. In addition, there are an unknown number of children in families which have incomes over $8,000 only because both parents are working. How are these children cared for? While the provision of subsidized day care may enable some mothers to work, other mothers who are working now make whatever arrangements they can for the care of their children. What is happening to these children?

* * * * * * *

---

[21] This estimate is low for reasons cited above.

6. Summary and Perspective

The volume of data that have been presented in previous sections may obscure some important results of the study. In this section we have provided a summary in the form of answers to key questions that might be asked of the report.

6.1 How much day care is there?

Estimates can only be made for full-day care since a day care center was considered ineligible for inclusion in the study unless it had at least one full-day enrollee. With this restriction, an estimated 1.3 million children are in full-day care, of whom 710,000 are in day care homes and 575,000 in day care centers. These figures represent all children regardless of family income or working status of mother. There are an estimated 17,500 centers with an average enrollment of 33 full-day children per center and 450,000 day care homes with an average enrollment per home of 1.6 full-day children.

There are many substitutes for the care that occurs in day care centers and day care homes. In this regard, the general population survey, which inquired about arrangements for children of working mothers, only covered families with incomes below $8,000 per year and with children 9 years old or younger, so it is not possible to compare directly the two parts of the survey. However, even in this restricted population of low-income families with working mothers and young children it was estimated that

2.2 million children are cared for in the home (all but 300,000 by relatives)
580,000 are cared for by relatives outside the home
30,000 are watched by the mother while she is at work

plus various other in-school and before- and after-school arrangements. There is some duplication in the above counts because they refer to "arrangements" rather than "children," and one child may have more than one arrangement.

What constitutes the entire population of day care, including nonworking mothers and all income levels, cannot be determined from the present study. However, a sample of parents of children in day care centers was asked an income question. The responses were not weighted, so inferences are risky, but 256 out of 550 reported incomes above $8,000 per year. It is clear, then, that the general population survey of low- and moderate-income families omits a large number of "arrangements" made by working mothers above the $8,000 cutoff.

6.2 What is day care like?

The diversity of facilities, management, ownership and programs in day care centers is striking. Centers (not including day care homes) were classified into three groups by completeness of program. Those with the most nearly custodial programs (Type A) are predominantly proprietary centers (79%) that own their own facilities (77%). This contrasts with the most nearly complete programs (Type C) where 17 percent of the centers are proprietary and where only 18 percent own their own facilities. Type A centers generally do not maintain written activity schedules (18%) while Type C do (91%). Fewer than 10 percent of Type A centers provide physical examinations, dental examinations, vision tests, speech tests, hearing tests, psychological testing and social work; while the percentages for Type C are physical examinations, 27 percent; dental examinations, 30 percent; vision tests, 86 percent; speech tests, 64 percent; hearing tests, 71 percent; psychological testing, 67 percent; and social work, 74 percent.

Type A centers have one certified teacher per 470 full-day children while Type C centers have one per 35 full-day children. Full-day equivalent children per child-related staff person are 15 for Type A and six for Type C. Parents generally do not participate in Type A child care, policy making and fund raising (less than 10% in each activity), but do participate in such activities in Type C centers (28 to 46%).

Average fees tend to be higher in Type C centers, but a smaller percentage of children pay fees because of government and community support.

Emerging from the above comparisons is the impression that existing day care is difficult to characterize in terms of averages or medians. Day care is heterogeneous; and variables such as size, ownership, programs, staff capabilities and fees interact heavily upon each other.

Over half of the centers provide some before- and/or after-school care—about half of those providing such care have a recreational program and about one-fourth have educational or remedial programs. An estimated 87,000 children receive before- or after-school care from day care centers. An estimated 160 school districts provide before- and after-school care for an estimated 200,000 school-age children, mainly for a fee. All together, then, slightly over 100,000 school-age children receive organized care from centers and schools. The number who participate in organized community recreation programs or other types of care are unknown. No attempt has been made here to calibrate the need for before- and after-school care, but the household survey revealed about 1.8 million school-age children of working mothers with family incomes under $8,000 and with children 9 years of age or younger.

6.3 Who staffs day care centers?

An estimated 127,000 paid persons staff day care centers, of whom almost 60 percent are full time and about 80 percent are child-related (counting directors and assistant directors in this latter category). In addition, there are about 5,000 volunteer staff. About 6 percent of teachers and directors have less than a high school education and 27 percent are college graduates.

Salaries are low by most standards, the median salary for teachers being $358 per month. Neither educational level nor salaries appear to differ markedly by ethnicity of full time staff. Median age staff is 36 years and only 3 percent are over 65.

Fourteen percent of centers have someone certified in nursery-kindergarten, 12 percent of centers have certifications in early childhood development and 23 percent in elementary education.

About 70 percent of centers reported little or no difficulty in hiring staff members, an estimate that is important to cost estimates if the day care program is expanded.

6.4 What kind of day care is needed (or wanted)?

Center operators were asked their opinion concerning the needs of their communities for day care. About 45 percent perceived a need for more day care for working mothers and 34 percent for nonworking mothers. Eightyseven percent saw the need for more full-time day care, 58 percent the need for more part-day care for pre-school children and 73 percent the need for more after-school care. In general, a higher proportion of nonproprietary centers reported needs than did proprietary centers.

Parents interviewed in the household survey (income less than $8,000, children 9 years old or younger) were asked what they expected of a day care program. Provisions listed most frequently were:

	Percent of working mothers	Percent of nonworking mothers
Good care	62	58
Good food	55	56
Safe place to leave child	47	43
Training	38	30
Education (school readiness)	37	28

It is interesting to note that the rankings are identical and that the three provisions listed most frequently are all custodial features.

6.5 What does day care cost?

Properly, a discussion of costs should begin with careful definitions of what constitutes cost and of who pays the costs: the mother, the community, state and local governments, or the Federal government. The operator questionnaire asked for "total annual cost of operating . . ." which was divided by full day equivalent [22] enrollment and adjusted to a monthly basis to obtain average monthly cost of operation per full-time equivalent child. For proprietary centers the unweighted average cost was $38 per month and for nonproprietary centers $95 per month. The two are not entirely comparable because cost of nonproprietary centers includes cost of management which is most likely not included in costs of proprietary centers. Average revenue per full-day equivalent child for proprietary centers was $48 and for nonproprietary centers was $95, the same as average costs. Receipts per month ranged from $33 per full-day equivalent child in category A centers to $110 in category C centers.

6.6 Who pays the bill?

About 52 percent of the revenue of day care centers comes from parent fees (99 percent in proprietary centers and 2 percent in nonproprietary centers). About 19 percent comes from HEW and 5 percent from OEO. About 7.5 percent comes from local governments and 5.5 percent from community organizations. No other source accounts for more than 5 percent. The figures, of course, are subject to both sampling error and response error, which should be kept in mind in comparing them against external sources.

---

[22] Counting two half-day children as equivalent to one full-day child.

Also, parent fees are frequently paid by public assistance (17) and partly by public assistance and partly by parents (6). About half of nonproprietary centers reported no revenue received from fees.

6.7 What can be said about demand?

Demand for day care can be discussed in terms of effective demand, that is, the number of enrollments that will be effected under given costs, characteristics of day care, and social and economic conditions. It can also be interpreted in terms of "need". The latter interpretation requires a set of subjective judgments since need for day care cannot be quantified as can need for nutritional elements.

On the other hand, measurement of effective demand requires quantification of the manner in which such things as employment patterns, changing trends toward employment of women, marriage and divorce rates, fertility ratios, and other social patterns reflect themselves in the number of day care slots of specified "quality" occupied at a specified price. The concept is further complicated by the subsidization of centers. Presumably, demand for slots could be greatly stimulated by increasing quality and subsidization.

In spite of the above limitations, this study presents some estimates that have general purpose usefulness to those who are concerned with estimation of demand.

First, day care operators were asked how many children were on their waiting lists. Recognizing the weaknesses in such reporting, the estimate of 124,000 of whom 98,000 are on waiting lists of licensed nonproprietary centers, still has some substantial import. The high number in nonproprietary centers, where fees tend to be low or not charged at all, implies that much of this evident demand might disappear if slots were made available at fees which would approximately replace costs.

Many centers are "above capacity" as determined by the comparison of enrollment plus waiting lists with licensed capacity. Such deficiencies amount to 33,000 for licensed proprietary centers and 108,000 for licensed nonproprietary centers. On the other hand, there are 31,000 available slots (by the same arithmetic) in both proprietary and nonproprietary centers. Evidently, there is some distribution problem in connection with available slots.

We have some estimates of the "need" for day care of working mothers in families with incomes below $8,000 and children 9 years of age or less. It seems reasonable to speculate that the number of arrangements for preschool children provides a rough estimate of potential demand for working low income parents. There are an estimated 3.7 million such arrangements, of which 2.2 million constitute care in the home, 583,000 represent care by relatives outside the home, 500,000 are in day care homes and 240,000 are in day care centers. It should be remembered that, for any number of reasons, the typical day care pattern is multiple arrangements for a substantial percent of the chidren in day care. It appears, therefore, that a logical expectation associated with the expansion of organized day care would be a relative decline in the total number of arrangements.

The degree of substitutability among these arrangements is unknown. However, with respect to preschool children, about 36 percent indicated that they desired no change, 23 percent wanted a change to care in their own homes and 33 percent wanted day care centers. A substantial, but unknown, percentage of the latter group were already in day care centers. Also, care in the home tends either to be feasible because of family composition or infeasible for this income group because of cost. Median fees that working mothers indicated a willingness to pay for the desired change in day care arrangements were $8.60 per week, including 16 percent who indicated they could pay nothing. Eliminating this latter group, the median is about $10. There is little evidence here that massive shifts toward care in centers tend to be substantially higher than the fees which mothers are willing to pay.

It is interesting to note, however, that 27 percent of nonworking mothers indicated a preference for day care centers and 45 percent for care in the home. These figures are in marked contrast with actual arrangements made by working mothers. For nonworking black mothers, the percentages were 52 and 27 for centers and care in home, respectively.

About half of nonworking mothers in the target population had worked since becoming parents. About 500,000 or 10 percent of the nonworking mothers were looking for work at the time of the survey. Thus, an increase in number of employed women coupled with the stated desire for care in centers by 27 percent of them could be reflected in an increase in effective demand.

6.8 If more slots were provided, what would they cost?

Obviously, cost depends upon the nature of the product. No information was gathered on startup cost, costs for new facilities, and so on. Also, there is reason to believe that space costs are inadequately represented in total costs. Respondents tend to overlook space costs or forget that they were charged less than cost or that space was donated to them. With these limitations, the estimated cost per child/month for the most nearly complete day care programs (category C) is about $110 and for the most nearly custodial programs (category A) is around $30 per month. For category B, the large middle class of centers, cost is around $50 per month (costs are $45 and receipts are $56).

One can only speculate on the increases over these figures represented by the marginal costs of making new slots available. Evidently only moderate difficulty is being encountered in hiring staff although qualifications as perceived by operators may not coincide with those of the Federal interagency day care requirements. Clearly, there are substantial departures from those standards with respect to a number of staff personnel.

The availability and cost of facilities, including renovation costs, are highly speculative and no information has been obtained on these items.

* * * * * * *

ESTIMATED PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF DAY CARE CENTERS[1] BY OPERATING AGENCY

	Percent of total
United fund and community agencies	8.4
Community action agency	11.2
Church	17.6
Welfare department	2.9
Private companies	57.9
Other	2.0
Total	100.0

---

[1] With full-day enrollment of 7 or more children.

Source: Westinghouse Learning Corporation. *Day Care Survey 1970: Summary Report and Basic Analysis*, Table 2.12, page 40.

ESTIMATED PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF DAY CARE CENTERS[1] BY KIND OF BUILDING IN WHICH CENTER IS LOCATED

	Percent of total
Single dwelling unit	39.0
Duplex dwelling unit	1.5
Apartment building	1.8
Building for day care	21.9
Church	22.2
Community center	3.6
Store front	1.5
Public housing	1.7
School	3.3
Other	3.5
Total	100.0

---

[1] With full-day enrollment of 7 or more children.

Source: Westinghouse Learning Corporation, *Day Care Survey 1970: Summary Report and Basic Analysis*, Table 2.18, page 45.

ESTIMATED PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF PARENTS WITH CHILDREN IN DAY CARE CENTERS [1] BY ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME

Annual family income	Percent in— Proprietary facilities	Percent in— Nonproprietary facilities	Percent in— All facilities
Less than $2,000	1.8	16.3	7.8
$2,000 to $3,999	7.7	36.9	19.7
$4,000 to $5,999	18.5	25.0	21.2
$6,000 to $7,999	22.7	11.2	17.9
$8,000 to $9,999	25.2	5.3	17.0
$10,000 or more	24.1	5.3	16.4

[1] With full-day enrollment of 7 or more children.

Source: Westinghouse Learning Corporation, *Day Care Survey 1970: Summary Report and Basic Analysis*, Table 2.57, page 82.

ESTIMATED PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF DAY CARE CENTERS [1] PROVIDING BEFORE AND AFTER SCHOOL CARE FOR SCHOOL-AGE CHILDREN

	Percent of total
Centers offering no care for school-age children	43.7
Centers offering care for school-age children:	
Before school only	10.2
After school only	33.6
Before and after school	29.3

[1] With full-time enrollment of 7 or more children.

Source: Westinghouse Learning Corporation, *Day Care Survey 1970: Summary Report and Basic Analysis*, table 2.31, page 57.

ESTIMATED PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF FULL-DAY CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS BY ANNUAL COST TO MOTHER,[1] 1970

[In percent]

Type of arrangement	Total	Under $100 annually	$100 to $200 annually	$200 to $350 annually	$350 to $650 annually	More than $650 annually
Child in school	100.0	100.0				
Mother watches at work	100.0	100.0				
Child cares for self	100.0	100.0				
In-home care	100.0	82.1	2.2	5.6	9.1	1.0
Out-of-home care	100.0	14.7	8.2	22.6	35.2	19.3
Total	100.0	69.5	3.1	8.3	13.2	6.0

[1] Includes mothers with at least 1 child under 10 years old and with family income of less than $8,000.

Source: Based on Westinghouse Learning Corp., *Day Care Survey 1970: Summary Report and Basic Analysis*, table 4.36, p. 190.

APPENDIX C

Standards and Costs for Day Care

(Prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Child Development in 1967)

NOTES

A. This analysis is divided into three parts representing distinct types of day care situations:

(1) Care in a center for the full day;
(2) Care in a foster home for the full day; and
(3) Care in a center before and after school and during the summer.

There are many possible variations in the use of these three types, but most commonly, group one is used for children 3–6, group two for children under three and group three for children of school age (up to 14).

B. Costs can vary enormously depending on the areas of the country being served. For example, Federal agencies report a range of $1,000 to $1,900 for the same type of program in various parts of the nation. These variations reflect differences in salary and cost levels as well as differences in the kinds of services generally available to a child (e.g., the existence or non-existence of a Medicaid program). In the analysis most of the costs are based on Head Start experience with day care programs of the group one type. It should be remembered that Head Start programs generally have 10–20% of their costs covered by non-Federal contributions which may or may not be available to Social Security Day Care programs.

C. The analysis projects standards at three different levels of quality: (1) minimum, (2) acceptable and (3) desirable. "Minimum" is defined as the level essential to maintaining the health and safety of the child, but with relatively little attention to his development needs. "Acceptable" is defined to include a basic program of development activities as well as providing minimum custodial care. "Desirable" is defined to include the full range of general and specialized developmental activities suitable to *individualized* development. Individual experts will differ as to the elements required for each level of quality. Most experts feel that the disadvantages to children of a "minimum" level program far outweigh the advantages of having the mother work. Some will feel that for children from "disadvantaged" homes only the "desirable" level is appropriate. The figures shown represent a consensus among a number of experts of what would be required at each level of quality.

D. The costs shown are potentially reduceable by the availability of free space or transportation and by the availability of services such as medical care through other funding sources. Fees paid by the parents will also reduce costs. Under the Social Security legislation, 25% of the cost is provided through state funds so the Federal cost in net may be 60–70% of the totals shown.

STANDARDS AND COSTS OF DAY CARE: TABLE A, COMPARATIVE SUMMARY OF COST PER CHILD

	Minimum	Acceptable	Desirable
Group day care: Generally used for 3–5 year olds (total)	$1,245	$1,862	$2,320
Foster day care: Generally used for children under 3 (total)	1,423	2,032	2,372
Before and after school and summer care: Generally used for children 6–13 (total)	310	653	653

STANDARDS AND COSTS OF DAY CARE: TABLE B, FULL DAY IN A CENTER

[Based on centers providing service 10–12 hours a day, 5 days a week]

Program element	Levels of quality					
	Minimum		Acceptable		Desirable	
	Description	Annual cost per child	Description	Annual cost per child	Description	Annual cost per child
1. Food, meals, and snacks	1 meal and snacks	$140	2 meals and snacks	$210	2 meals and snacks	$210
2. Transportation	Provided at parent expense		Provided by center	60	Provided by center	60
3. Medical and dental services.	Examination and *referral* services.	20	Examination and referral service.	20	Examinations, treatment when not otherwise available, and health education.	60
4. Work with parents	Little or none except on problem cases.	10	General parent activities plus limited counseling services.	30	Parent education, family-type activities, full counseling services.	70
5. Facilities and utilities (rental).	Space meeting State and local licensing requirements.	90	Same	90	Space providing more generous room for child activities plus room for work with parents.	110
6. Clothing and other emergency needs.	As necessary	20	As necessary	20	As necessary	20
7. Supplies and materials	Custodial program	40	General developmental program.	50	Individualized developmental program.	75
8. Equipment (annual replacement costs).	do	10	do	12	do	15
9. Staff:						
(a) Classroom, professional at 6,500.	1 per 20 children	275	1 per 15 children	405	1 per 15 children	405
(b) Classroom, nonprofessional at 4,400.	2 per 20 children	320	2 per 15 children	420	3 per 15 children	640

STANDARDS AND COSTS OF DAY CARE: TABLE B, FULL DAY IN A CENTER—Continued

[Based on centers providing service 10–12 hours a day, 5 days a weeks]

Program element	Levels of quality					
	Minimum		Acceptable		Desirable	
	Description	Annual cost per child	Description	Annual cost per child	Description	Annual cost per child
9. Staff—Continued						
(c) Social service, professional at 6,600.	1 per 150 children	$65	1 per 100 children	$65	1 per 100 children	$65
(d) Community, social service, parent or health aides at 4,400.	None		do	20	2 per 100 children	45
(e) Business and maintenance at 4,000.	2 per 100 children	80	3 per 100 children	120	3 per 100 children	120
(f) Special resource personnel (psychology, music, art, consultants, etc.) at 6,500.	Urgent need only	20	1 per 100 children	60	2 per 100 children	120
(g) Supervision at 8,000.	1 per 100 children	80	2 per 100 children	160	2 per 100 children	160
10. Training	Approximately 10 percent of salary costs.	75	Approximately 10 percent of salary costs.	120	Approximately 10 percent of salary costs.	145
Total per child		1,245		1,862		2,320

STANDARDS AND COSTS OF DAY CARE: TABLE C, FOSTER DAY CARE SITUATION

[Based on centers providing service 10–12 hours a day, 5 days a week]

Program element	Levels of quality					
	Minimum		Acceptable		Desirable	
	Description	Annual cost per child	Description	Annual cost per child	Description	Annual cost per child
1. Food, meals and snacks	1 meal and snacks	$100	2 meals and snacks	$150	2 meals and snacks	$150
2. Transportation	Parents responsible		Parents responsible		Parents responsible	
3. Medical and dental services.	Examination and referral services.	20	Examination and referral services.	20	Examinations, treatment when not otherwise available and health education.	60
4. Work with parents	Little or none except on problem cases.	10	General parent activities plus limited counseling services.	30	Parent education family type activities, full counseling services.	70
5. Facilities and utilities (rental).	Special maintenance allowance in lieu of rent plus central administrative space.	30	Same	30	Same	30
6. Clothing and other emergency needs.	As necessary	20	As necessary	20	As necessary	20
7. Supplies and materials	Limited developmental	20	Developmental program	35	Enriched developmental	50
8. Equipment (annual replacement costs).	do	9	do	15	do	20
9. Staff						
(a) Day care mother at 4,400.	1 per 5 children	880	1 per 4 children	1,100	1 per 4 children	1,100
(b) Social service professional at 6,600.	1 per 150 children	44	1 per 100 children	66	1 per 100 children	66

STANDARDS AND COSTS OF DAY CARE: TABLE C, FOSTER DAY CARE SITUATION—Continued

[Based on centers providing service 10-12 hours a day, 5 days a weeks]

Program element	Levels of quality					
	Minimum		Acceptable		Desirable	
	Description	Annual cost per child	Description	Annual cost per child	Description	Annual cost per child
9. Staff—Continued						
(c) Community, social service, parent or health aides at 4,400.	None		1 per 100 children	$44	2 per 100 children	$44
(d) Business at $4,400	2 per 100 children	$80	2 per 100 children	80	do	80
(e) Special resource personnel, (psychology, music, art, consultants, etc.) at $6,600.	Urgent needs only	20	do	132	4 per 100 children	264
(f) Supervision at $8,000.	1 per 100 children at $8,000.	80	do	160	3 per 100 children	240
10. Training	Approximately 10 percent of salary costs.	110	Approximately 10 percent of salary costs.	150	Approximately of salary costs.	178
Total		1,423		2,032		2,372

STANDARDS AND COSTS OF DAY CARE: TABLE D, BEFORE AND AFTER SCHOOL AND SUMMER CARE

[Based on centers providing service 10–12 hours a day, 5 days a week]

Program element	Levels of quality					
	Minimum		Acceptable		Desirable	
	Description	Annual cost per child	Description	Annual cost per child	Description	Annual cost per child
During school months (40 weeks).						
1. Food, meals and snacks	Snack	$30	Snack and breakfast	$70	Snack and breakfast	$70
2. Work with parents	Urgent only	10	Supplementary to school services.	20	Supplementary to school services.	20
3. Facilities	Assume use of school or other nonrent facilities.	10	Same	10	Same	10
4. Supplies and materials	Custodial	20	Developmental	40	Developmental	40
5. Equipment (annual replacement costs).	do	10	do	15	do	15
6. Personnel:						
(a) Day care workers at $4,400.	1 per 25 children for 3 hours.	53	1 per 15 children for 3 hours.	88	1 per 15 children for 3 hours.	88
(b) Special resource personnel, $6,60C.	None		1 per 45	66	1 per 45	66
(c) Business at $4,000.	1 per 250 children	12	1 per 250 children	12	1 per 250 children	12
(d) Supervision at $8,000.	do	24	2 per 250 children	24	2 per 250 children	24
7. Training		9		28		28

STANDARDS AND COSTS OF DAY CARE: TABLE D, BEFORE AND AFTER SCHOOL AND SUMMER CARE—Continued

[Based on centers providing service 10–12 hours a day, 5 days a weeks]

	Levels of quality					
	Minimum		Acceptable		Desirable	
Program element	Description	Annual cost per child	Description	Annual cost per child	Description	Annual cost per child
Summer period (12 weeks):						
1. Food, meals and snacks	Snacks and 1 meal	$35	Snacks and 2 meals	$50	Snacks and 2 meals	$50
2. Work with parents	Urgent only	5	Supplementary to school services.	15	Supplementary to school	15
3. Facilities	Assume use of school or other nonrent facilities.	20	Some	20	Same	20
4. Supplies and materials	Custodial	10	Developmental	15	Developmental	15
5. Equipment (annual replacement costs).	do	5	do	10	do	10
6. Personnel:						
(a) Recreation supervisors at $4,400.	1 per 25 children (8 hours per day).	40	1 per 15 children (8 hours per day).	65	1 per 15 children (8 hours per day).	65
(b) Special resource personnel at $6,600.	None		1 per 30 children	55	1 per 30 children	55
(c) Business at $4,000.	1 per 250 children	4	1 per 250 children	4	1 per 250 children	4
(d) Supervision at $8,000.	do	8	3 per 250 children	24	3 per 250 children	24
7. Training	Approximately 10 percent of salaries.	5	Approximately 15 percent of salaries.	22	Approximately 15 percent of salaries.	22
Total		310		653		653

APPENDIX D

Excerpts From a Study on the Cost of Child Care Submitted to the Office of Child Development by the Inner City Fund[1]

[NOTE: In 1972 the Inner City Fund prepared for the Office of Child Development a study of the cost of child care which met certain standards. These proposed standards differed from the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirement (reproduced here in Appendix I) in a number of respects; the most important differences affecting cost concern the maximum number of children of various ages permitted per staff member. Table 1 of the part of the study excerpted here shows the staff-child ratios included in the proposed standards. Certain minor changes (such as renumbering the tables) have been made in the excerpts printed here.]

* * * * * * *

METHODOLOGY

The methodology used to estimate child care costs in Washington, D.C. rests on several crucial assumptions. Specifically:

—capital, labor, and material inputs for each type of child care program come as nearly as possible from the proposed requirements. Where the requirements do not specify precise inputs (such as the amount or type of consumable equipment) our estimates are based on existing quality programs and the intent of the requirements.

—costs are estimated for calendar year 1972.

—costs are based on an established and efficiently-managed program—there is no allowance for start-up costs (which will be handled directly by the administering agency) or inefficient management. Attendance as a percentage of enrollment and enrollment as a percentage of capacity are both assumed to be 100 percent. Over-enrollment is encouraged to ensure capacity operation.

—costs reflect only actual costs incurred—no allowance for profits is included. Non-cash costs (such as depreciation) are included.

—estimates cover day care operator costs only. No ancillary services or administrative costs (which will be financed through the day care administering agency) are included.

---

[1] Submitted July 1972 pursuant to contract HEW-OS-72-110; prepared by Donald G. Ogilvie.

Cost estimates were derived through a computer model which simulates day care operations over time under various assumptions about size, quality, and enrollment rates. Appendix 1 explains the model design, data inputs, and program logic.

WASHINGTON, D.C. COSTS

The first phase of our project was to estimate the cost of day care programs in Washington, D.C. which complied with the proposed day care requirements. Wherever possible, costs represent current prices in Washington, D.C. For example, head teachers' salaries are based on the starting salary of elementary school teachers in the Washington, D.C. public school system. The Washington, D.C. minimum wage was used as the salary for teacher aides and family day care mothers. All Washington, D.C. costs and the rationale supporting them are shown in appendix 2.

These estimates are subject to several qualifications. First, uncertainty exists about the differences in inputs needed to meet some aspects of the proposed day care requirements. For example, more books, materials, and consumable equipment are preferable to less, but reliable estimates of the amount of such equipment needed to comply with the developmental standards of the requirements are unavailable.

Second, for inputs with widely variable costs (such as land) we have tried to identify reasonable levels. However, these costs will not be realistic in some neighborhoods. Finally, we have made no provision for overtime. Costs are based on a center operating 9 hours per day, day care staff members work 8 hours per day and staff schedules are adjusted to cover the full 9-hour day.

PROGRAM COSTS

Table 1 summarizes our estimated annual cost per child in alternative types of day care programs in Washington, D.C. Estimates are based on a 100-percent attendance rate, which produces the highest cost per child for any enrollment level. The annual cost per child, however, is not appreciably affected by this assumption about attendance rates. The only attendance related expenditure (the cost of providing meals and snacks) declines proportionately as attendance declines. For example, if the attendance rate is 90 percent, the annual cost figure for any preschool child is reduced by $17.50 and the cost for a school age child is reduced by $10.50.

TABLE 1.—ESTIMATED CHILD CARE PROGRAM COSTS IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

Age groups	Family day care home	Staff/child ratios	Day care centers, occupancy charges based on: Commercial rental rates	Residential rental rates	Own facility	No occupancy charge
Infants	$1,874	1:3	$2,868	$2,753	$2,779	$2,675
Toddlers	1,455	1:4	2,551	2,436	2,464	2,359
Preschool:	1,044					
36 to 53 months		1:7	1,811	1,702	1,730	1,630
		1:9	1,679	1,563	1,590	1,486
54 to 71 months		1:10	1,546	1,438	1,468	1,366
School age:						
K to 9	788	1:12	1,134	1,022	[1] NA	941
		1:13	1,090	968	NA	887
9 to 11	788	1:15	1,006	887	NA	806
		1:16	974	852	NA	776
12 to 14	788	1:20	930	812	NA	735

Source: Inner city fund.

---

[1] Not applicable.

SENSITIVITY OF COST ESTIMATES

This section estimates the sensitivity of day care costs to changes in two key input variables:

(1) Enrollment as a percentage of capacity is varied between 99.9, 90, 85, or 80 percent;

(2) The rental charge per square foot is set at either $2.00 for a residential facility or $5.00 for a commercial facility.

Table 2 shows estimated annual costs per child at three levels—low, medium, and high. For center care, the low cost level is based on full utilization of capacity (99.9 percent enrollment) and rental in a residential facility (the lower rent option). The medium cost level is based on full utilization of capacity in a commercial facility. The high cost level represents 90 percent enrollment in a center utilizing commercial space. No rental costs are included in the estimates for family home care; the low cost level represents full capacity utilization, and the high cost level is based on 90 percent enrollment.

Table 3 shows how costs for each age group vary by enrollment rates. (Rental costs are set at $5.00 per square foot.) For each age group, costs increase about 10 percent for each 10 percent decline in enrollment.

Table 4 compares ICF cost estimates to estimates previously developed by the Office of Child Development for preschool and school age children receiving center care. ICF estimates are greater for both age groups. For preschool children the ICF estimate of annual total cost per child exceeds OCD's estimated costs by $235 or 18 percent. ICF's estimate of school age day care costs is $812, about six percent greater than OCD's estimate of $765.

ICF's higher estimates reflect some substantial differences in cost by category. For preschool children, ICF estimates are considerably higher for the cost of administrative staff, $338 compared to $184. For a center of 36 children, administrative staff salaries total $12,189 under ICF assumptions; this represents the cost of a full time director and half time secretary. The lower OCD estimate represents only a part time director or supervisor for a center of this size.

TABLE 2.—ESTIMATED ANNUAL COSTS PER CHILD

Age group	Staff/child ratio	Estimated annual cost per child		
		Low	Medium	High
Infants:				
Center	1:3	$2,753	$2,868	$3,164
Home	1:3	1,874	....	2,043
Toddlers:				
Center	1:4	2,436	2,551	2,813
Home	1:4	1,455	....	1,583
Preschool:				
Center	1:7	1,702	1,811	1,991
	1:9	1,563	1,679	1,844
	1:10	1,438	1,546	1,697
Home	1:6	1,044	....	1,140
School age:				
Center	1:12	1,022	1,134	1,248
	1:13	968	1,090	1,193
	1:15	887	1,006	1,103
	1:16	852	974	1,069
	1:20	812	930	1,025
Home	1:6	788	....	863

Source: Inner City Fund.

TABLE 3.—ENROLLMENT RATES AND ANNUAL DAY CARE CENTER COST

Age groups	Annual cost and enrollment as a percentage of capacity						
	0.999	0.90	Percent change, 0.90 above 0.999	0.85	Percent change, 0.85 above 0.90	0.80	Percent change, 0.80 above 0.85
Infants	$2,868	$3,164	+10.3	$3,340	+5.6	$3,538	+5.9
Toddlers	2,551	2,813	+10.3	2,968	+5.5	3,142	+5.9
Preschool	1,546	1,697	+9.8	1,787	+5.3	1,887	+5.6

Source: Inner city fund.

00200

TABLE 4.—COMPARISON OF ANNUAL COST PER CHILD ESTIMATES

	Day care center: Preschool age children		Day care center: School age children	
	OCD cost per child	ICF cost estimates	OCD cost per child	ICF cost estimates
Teaching staff	$654	$729	[1] $360	$292
Director and secretary	184	338	88	112
Janitor	92	58	33	58
Cook	114	....	33	....
Facilities rental and utilities	90	90	60	90
Meals and snacks	113	175	75	105
Supplies [2]	63	40	90	100
Equipment replacement costs	12	[3] 6	20	[3] 5
Insurance	6	....	6	....
Other	....	127	....	50
Total	1,328	1,563	765	812

[1] Includes resource specialists at $74 per child.
[2] Includes costs of transportation for field trips.
[3] Includes depreciation of equipment over a 10-year period.

Source: Inner city fund.

Another large cost difference for preschool children is in the category of meals and snacks. The ICF estimate of $175 per child is based on the cost of providing prepared lunches which only require heating before being served. This can be done by a member of the caregiver staff, so we include no costs for a cook. OCD's total cost of providing meals and snacks is $227, about evenly divided between the cook's wages and the cost of food. This is 30 percent greater than the ICF estimate. OCD's estimate of the cost of meals and snacks for school age children is $108, only $3 greater than the ICF estimate.

Our estimate of the cost of a janitor's salary is considerably lower for preschool children, $58 contrasted to $92. Our estimate is based on one half-time janitor for a center enrolling 36 children, whereas OCD's estimate assumes one full time janitor for every 50 children. Conversely, OCD's cost of a janitor is much lower for school age children, $33, which reflects the use of one janitor per 100 children while our estimate is unchanged.

Finally, some variation is due to differing assumptions regarding wages and salaries. OCD estimates assume a salary of $5,200 per year for professional staff and $1.50 per hour for non-professional staff. Our estimates are based on current entry level teacher's salaries and minimum wage rates in Washington, D.C. which are substantially higher.

GEOGRAPHICAL COST VARIATIONS

Methodology

The methodology used to estimate geographical cost variations is summarized below:

- The major cost inputs which can be expected to show significant regional cost differentials were identified. Eight inputs were selected for center day care: teachers' and administrators' salaries; secretary's salary; janitors' wages; caregivers' wages; rent and utilities; the cost of food; other items; and transportation costs (for school age children only). Four of these were used to develop cost indices for family day care: caregivers' wages; the cost of food; other items; and transportation costs.
- Previously published indices or regional cost data were obtained for each input.
- Indices reflecting urban and rural cost differences were developed for four geographical regions representing the Northeastern, North Central, Southern, and Western United States.
- Cost indices were computed for 30 major cities to illustrate the wide range of costs between urban areas.
- Indices for each input were computed by setting the costs for Washington, D.C. equal to 1.00 and calculating the relative costs in each region and city. (See Tables 12 and 13 for a list of all cost indices.)
- Composite cost indices for providing center and family day care for each age group were computed by determining the total input costs for each region or city (based on the input cost indices) and computing the ratio of total Washington, D.C. costs to costs in each selected region or city.

Qualifications

The comparative cost data obtained from other sources are subject to error. Further, the data bases from which our cost indices were obtained vary. For example, our estimates of regional food cost differentials are based on unpublished data compiled by the Department of Agriculture for each state. Estimates of caregivers' compensation differentials are also on a statewide basis, determined by the minimum wage. Other urban regional indices are based on costs in a sample of cities in the region; the cities included in the samples differ from index to index.

For Washington, D.C. costs, we developed center cost estimates for programs in a rented residential facility, commercial facility, newly constructed facility, or a facility with no occupancy charge. The regional cost indices are based on a rental cost index for residential facilities only. While adequate indices for regional variations in construction costs are available, appropriate indices of regional variations in land costs or costs of leasing commercial space are not. Since rental costs represent only a small proportion of total costs in our cost estimates ($90 per child in a residential facility and $206 in a commercial facility), and residential and commercial rental costs probably follow a similar pattern, the indices developed probably are representative of total cost differences for center care in all types of facilities.

Geographical variations in the largest cost components of providing day care—teachers' and caregivers' salaries respectively—account to a large extent for geographical differentials in total costs. Our estimates of geographical variations in teachers' salaries, based on starting salaries in selected school districts, 1971–72, are unlikely to change substantially in the near future. However, our estimates of caregivers' salaries are based on the Federal minimum wage in most states (since it is equal to or higher than most state minimum wages).

Regional Cost Indices

Regional cost indices for center day care designed to meet the proposed day care requirements are shown in Table 5. Within regions, urban-rural costs vary about 10 percent. Costs are highest in the urban Northeast and lowest in the rural South. Within any one age group, costs vary up to 20 percent.

Table 6 shows regional cost indices for family day care. The Federal minimum wage of $1.60 per hour has been used in most states (because it is higher than most state minimum wages). The Washington, D.C. minimum wage of $2.25 per hour produces the highest cost of family day care of the 30 SMSA's studied. Since data on the cost of food and the minimum wage are available on a statewide basis only, the differences between urban and rural cost within regions are due to variations in the costs of "transportation" and "other items." Since these expenditures are relatively minor in relation to total costs, the indices show little variation within regions.

Cost Indices for Thirty Cities

Table 7 shows indices for center day care in thirty major cities. Cities are ranked according to the value of the index for infant child care costs. There is some variation in the rank of the cities between age groups and in the values of indices for the same cities because of the differences in the input mix for different age groups. For example, caregiver staff costs represent substantially larger proportions of total costs for infant and toddler care than for any category of school age day care. Thus the cost indices for these inputs are weighted more heavily for infant and toddler care than for school age child care. No aides are included in cost model for 12–14 year old children (See Table 14), so the effect of lower cost aides in other cities is removed, making costs for children of this age group relatively high compared to Washington, D.C. costs.

New York and Chicago are the only cities with higher costs than Washington, D.C. (except for Philadelphia and San Francisco for the 12–14 year old group). The table indicates that there is a wide variation of costs between these cities, ranging from, for example, 1.08 for New York to .82 for Wichita for toddlers.

Table 8 shows cost indices for family day care based on teachers' wages, cost of food, transportation, and all other items. Since Washington, D.C. has the highest minimum wage and food costs, costs in other cities appear to be substantially lower—about 25 to 30 percent on the average. These indices are subject to the qualification that the Federal minimum wage may be increased to $2.00 per hour.

TABLE 5.—REGIONAL COST INDEXES FOR CENTER DAY CARE

	Infants	Toddlers	Preschool (36 to 53 mos.)	Preschool (54 to 71 mos.)	Grade 1 to age 8	Age 9 to 11	Age 12 to 14
Washington, D.C.	$1.00	$1.00	$1.00	$1.00	$1.00	$1.00	$1.00
Cost	2,949.00	2,436.00	1,702.00	1,438.00	968.00	852.00	812.00
Northeast:							
Urban	1.00	1.01	1.02	1.02	1.00	1.00	1.04
Rural	.87	.88	.88	.86	.90	.91	.93
North Central:							
Urban	.93	.94	.96	.95	.95	.95	1.00
Rural	.83	.84	.85	.86	.88	.89	.92
South:							
Urban	.88	.89	.89	.89	.89	.89	.91
Rural	.78	.78	.79	.79	.81	.82	.83
West:							
Urban	.88	.89	.90	.91	.92	.92	.95
Rural	.80	.81	.82	.82	.85	.86	.87

Source: Inner city fund.

00204

TABLE 6.—REGIONAL COST INDEXES FOR FAMILY DAY CARE

	Infants	Toddlers	Preschool	School age
Washington, D.C.	$1.00	$1.00	$1.00	$1.00
Cost	1,874.00	1,455.00	1,044.00	788.00
Northeast:				
Urban	.78	.79	.79	.80
Rural	.78	.78	.78	.81
North-central:				
Urban	.72	.72	.73	.75
Rural	.72	.72	.72	.75
South:				
Urban	.78	.78	.78	.79
Rural	.71	.71	.71	.74
West:				
Urban	.73	.73	.73	.75
Rural	.72	.72	.72	.75

Source: Inner city fund.

TABLE 7.—CENTER DAY CARE COST INDICES FOR 30 CITIES

	Infants	Toddlers	Preschool (36 to 54 months)	Preschool (54 to 71 months)	6 to 8 years	9 to 11 years	12 to 14 years
Washington, D.C.	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Cost	$2,949.00	$2,436.00	$1,702.00	$1,438.00	$968.00	$852.00	$812.00
New York	1.06	1.08	1.08	1.07	1.04	1.04	1.09
Chicago	1.04	1.06	1.08	1.07	1.05	1.06	1.02
Philadelphia	.97	.99	1.00	.99	.97	.96	1.02
Detroit	.94	.95	.96	.96	.96	.96	.98
Milwaukee	.93	.95	.96	.95	.94	.94	.99
San Francisco	.92	.93	.95	.95	.97	.97	1.01
Pittsburgh	.92	.94	.95	.94	.94	.94	.98
Buffalo	.91	.92	.93	.93	.94	.94	.93
Los Angeles	.90	.91	.93	.93	.94	.94	.97
Cleveland	.89	.91	.92	.93	.94	.94	.97
Baltimore	.89	.91	.93	.93	.93	.94	.97
Boston	.89	.90	.92	.92	.93	.93	.96

Green Bay	.88	.89	.90	.90	.90	.90	.93
San Diego	.88	.89	.91	.91	.92	.92	.95
Seattle	.88	.89	.91	.91	.93	.93	.96
Minneapolis	.87	.88	.89	.88	.89	.89	.93
Dayton	.86	.88	.90	.91	.92	.92	.95
Atlanta	.86	.87	.87	.87	.87	.87	.89
Indianapolis	.86	.87	.88	.89	.90	.90	.93
Cincinnati	.85	.86	.89	.88	.89	.89	.92
Baton Rouge	.85	.86	.86	.86	.85	.85	.88
St. Louis	.85	.86	.87	.86	.88	.86	.91
Houston	.84	.86	.87	.87	.86	.87	.90
Denver	.83	.84	.85	.85	.86	.86	.88
Nashville	.83	.83	.85	.85	.86	.86	.88
Orlando	.83	.84	.86	.86	.85	.87	.89
Portland, Maine	.83	.84	.86	.86	.88	.88	.90
Kansas City	.82	.83	.84	.84	.86	.86	.88
Dallas	.82	.84	.85	.86	.86	.86	.88
Wichita	.81	.82	.83	.83	.84	.84	.86

Source: Inner city fund.

TABLE 8.—FAMILY DAY CARE COST INDEXES FOR 30 CITIES

	Infants	Toddlers	Preschool	School age
Washington, D.C	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Cost	$1,874.00	$1,455.00	$1,044.00	$788.00
New York	.83	.83	.83	.84
Buffalo	.83	.83	.83	.85
Baltimore	.75	.76	.78	.76
Chicago	.75	.75	.77	.79
Los Angeles	.74	.74	.75	.77
San Francisco	.74	.74	.75	.77
San Diego	.74	.74	.75	.77
Cleveland	.74	.74	.75	.77
Dayton	.74	.74	.75	.76
Cincinnati	.74	.74	.75	.76
Dallas	.73	.73	.74	.75
Houston	.73	.73	.74	.75
Boston	.72	.72	.73	.75
Philadelphia	.72	.72	.73	.75
Pittsburgh	.72	.72	.73	.75
Orlando	.72	.72	.73	.74
Portland, Maine	.72	.72	.72	.74
Indianapolis	.72	.72	.72	.74
Seattle	.72	.72	.72	.74
Denver	.72	.72	.72	.74
Nashville	.72	.72	.72	.74
Kansas City	.72	.71	.71	.73
Baton Rouge	.71	.71	.71	.73
Green Bay	.71	.71	.71	.73
Detroit	.71	.71	.71	.73
Milwaukee	.71	.71	.71	.73
Wichita	.71	.71	.71	.72
Atlanta	.71	.71	.71	.73
St. Louis	.71	.70	.70	.73
Minneapolis	.70	.69	.68	.71

Source: Inner city fund.

* * * * * * *

WASHINGTON, D.C. INPUT COSTS

This section shows input cost data for Washington, D.C. used to estimate the cost of center day care. The source of all input cost assumptions are listed on pages 2 to 4.

Table 9 shows the assumed staff composition of the administrative and teaching staff for children not attending school, and table 10 presents similar information for school age children. The division of the caregiver staff between teachers and aides is an important determinant of total costs per child. A high number of teachers relative to aides in the caregiver staff will result in high costs per child. For all age groups except infants and 12 to 14 year olds, the caregiver staff is assumed to be about evenly divided between teachers and aides. For infants, there are three aides for every teacher. We assume that care required by infants probably can be adequately met by qualified aides, under the guidance of a professional child care expert. For 12 to 14 year olds, no aides are included in the caregiver staff. The counseling and developmental needs of adolescents probably can be best served by professional educators.

Table 11 shows annual costs per child for all major expenditure categories for all age groups.

DAY CARE INPUT COSTS IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

Staff costs:

Head teachers: $7,800 per year.	The starting salary for elementary school school teachers in the District of Columbia school system.
Aides: $2.25 per hour.....	The minimum wage for aides in Washington, D.C.
Clerk-secretary: $99.50 per week.	Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated salary.
Director: $9,000 per year.	The approximate salary of teachers with a few years experience.
Janitor: $2.05 per hour...	The minimum wage for janitors in Washington, D.C.

The employer's social security contribution is 5.2 percent of the 1st $9,000.

Rental charges:

Residential facility: $2 per square foot.	From the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates of rental costs in Washington, D.C. for families with low income budgets.
Commercial facility: $5 per square foot.	Approximate costs for commercial space in office buildings or shopping centers with low to moderate rentals.

Costs of a new facility:

Construction costs: $20 per square foot.	Approximate cost for a 1 story brick facility in Washington, D.C.
Value of land: $20,000 per site.	Approximates cost of land in Washington, D.C., subject to wide variations.
Interest rate on mortgage: 0.08 percent.	Represents approximate current interest rates.
Duration of mortgage: 30 years.	Represents usual length of mortgages.

Utilities:	
Commercial telephone: $7.50 per month.	The minimum monthly rate for a commercial telephone in Washington, D.C.
Residential telephone: $4.70 per month.	The minimum monthly rate for residential telephone service in Washington, D.C.
All electric residence (includes air conditioning): $0.36 per square foot.	Average charges to consumers in Washington, D.C.
Residence heated with gas (includes air conditioning): $0.30 per square foot.	Average charges to consumers in Washington, D.C.
Food:	
Lunch: $0.55 per day.....	Approximate cost of providing prepared hot lunches, meeting the Agriculture Department's type "A" requirements, in Washington, D.C.
Snack:	
$0.10 per snack per day.	Approximate cost of providing a nutritious snack.
$0.15 per snack per day.	Higher cost snack represents extra cost of a snack for school age children when no lunch is served.
Cost to equip 1 classroom: 0 to $1,000.	Costs range from 0 for school age children receiving care in a family care home to $1,000 for infants receiving care in a home or center.
Consumable equipment:	
$40......................	Approximate annual costs per preschool age child in a developmental program.
$100.....................	Approximate annual costs per school age child in a developmental program; an allowance of $1 per week per child for transportation expenses is included.
Maintenance: $1.50 per square foot per year.	Represents the wages of a half-time janitor receiving the minimum wage in Washington, D.C. plus cost of supplies for centers sizes 36 to 60, and a full-time janitor for large centers.

TABLE 9.—DAY CARE CENTER STAFF COMPOSITION: CHILDREN NOT ATTENDING SCHOOL

Staff	Infants (N=36)			Toddlers (N=36)			Preschool (N=36)		
	N	Salary	Staff costs [1]	N	Salary	Staff costs [1]	N	Salary	Staff costs [1]
Teachers	3	$7,800	$24,617	4	$7,800	$32,824	2	$7,800	$16,411
Aides	9	4,680	44,310	5	4,680	24,617	2	4,680	9,847
Total	12	....	68,927	10	....	57,441	4	....	26,258
Administrator	1	9,000	9,468	1	9,000	9,468	1	9,000	9,468
Secretary	1	2,587	2,721	1	2,587	2,721	1	2,587	2,721
Total	2	....	12,189	2	....	12,189	2	....	12,189

[1] Includes employer social security contribution of 5.2 percent of 1st $9,000.

Source: Inner city fund.

TABLE 10.—DAY CARE CENTER STAFF COMPOSITION: SCHOOL AGE CHILDREN

Staff	Grade 1 through age 8 (N=52)			Ages 9 through 11 (N=64)			Ages 12 through 14 (N=80)		
	N	Salary	Staff costs [1]	N	Salary	Staff costs [1]	N	Salary	Staff costs [1]
Teachers [2]	2	$5,550	$11,676	2	$5,550	$11,676	4	$5,550	$23,352
Aides [3]	2	3,290	6,922	2	3,290	6,922	0		
Total	4		18,598	4		18,598	4		23,352
Administrator [2]	1	6,406	6,739	1	6,406	6,739	1	6,406	6,739
Secretary [3]	1	2,091	2,199	1	2,091	2,199	1	2,091	2,199
Total	2		8,938	2		8,938	2		8,938

[1] Includes employer social security contribution of 5.2 percent of 1st $9,000.

[2] Salary based on 200 days for 5 hours/day and 60 days for 8 hours/day.

[3] Salary based on 40 weeks for 15 hours/week and 12 weeks for 20 hours/week.

Source: Inner city fund.

00212

TABLE 11.—ANNUAL COSTS PER CHILD BY MAJOR CATEGORY [1]

Category	Preschool (months)				School age (years)		
	0 to 18	19 to 35	36 to 53	54 to 71	6 to 8	9 to 11	12 to 14
Teachers and aides	$1,915	$1,596	$938	$656	$3,577	$291	$292
Administrator and secretary	338	338	338	338	172	137	112
Rental costs:							
Residential	77	77	77	77	77	77	77
Commercial	193	193	193	193	193	193	193
Food	175	175	175	175	105	105	105
Consumable equipment	40	40	40	40	100	100	100
Depreciation	8	6	6	6	4	3	5
Maintenance	58	58	58	58	58	58	58
Utilities	13	13	13	13	13	13	13
Totals:							
Other	129	133	57	75	81	68	50
Residential	2,753	2,436	1,702	1,438	968	852	812
Other	128	132	50	67	87	74	52
Commercial	2,868	2,551	1,811	1,546	1,090	974	930

[1] Assumes average center capacity of 36 children for preschool and center capacity ranging from 52 to 80 for school age children.

Source: Inner city fund.

* * * * * * *

00213

TABLE 12.—REGIONAL COST INDEXES FOR DAY CARE INPUTS

	Administrators and teachers	Secretary [1]	Janitor [1]	Aides [2]	Utilities and rent	Food [2]	Trans-portation	Other items
Northeast:								
Urban	$1.13	$0.97	$1.34	$0.77	$0.87	$0.84	$0.91	$0.99
Rural	.91	(.97)	(1.34)	.77	.80	.84	1.27	.74
North Central:								
Urban	1.04	.94	1.40	.71	.89	.76	.98	.96
Rural	.88	(.94)	(1.40)	.71	.92	.76	1.18	.74
South:								
Urban	.94	.89	1.01	.78	.89	.72	.94	.96
Rural	.81	(.87)	(1.01)	.71	.77	.72	1.17	.76
West:								
Urban	.94	.99	1.30	.72	1.01	.72	1.00	.95
Rural	.82	(.99)	(1.30)	.72	.89	.72	1.22	.75

[1] Estimates for rural wages were unavailable for secretaries and janitors. Urban indexes were used instead.

[2] Cost estimates for aides, based on the minimum wage, and for food are available on a statewide basis only.

Source: Inner city fund.

TABLE 13.—COST INDEXES FOR DAY CARE INPUTS IN 30 SELECTED CITIES

	Administrators and teachers	Secretary	Janitor	Aides	Utilities and rent	Food	Transportation	Other items
Washington, D.C.	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
New York	1.21	1.05	1.43	.82	.86	.85	.85	1.01
Chicago	1.20	1.01	1.41	.71	.95	1.00	1.02	.99
Philadelphia	1.14	.88	1.28	.71	.80	.76	.91	.95
Detroit	1.06	1.00	1.64	.71	.82	.66	.97	.94
Milwaukee	1.06	.94	1.25	.71	.93	.67	.93	.96
San Francisco	.99	.97	1.53	.73	1.08	.77	1.02	.97
Pittsburgh	1.04	.94	1.31	.71	.81	.76	.97	.93
Buffalo	.95	.94	1.30	.82	.84	.85	1.04	.96
Los Angeles	.97	1.03	1.29	.73	1.01	.77	1.00	.94
Cleveland	.96	.90	1.38	.71	.88	.89	1.00	.98
Baltimore	.97	.87	1.11	.71	.93	1.04	.98	.94
Green Bay	.96	.90	1.44	.71	.85	.67	.90	.90
San Diego	.95	.87	1.20	.73	.94	.77	.99	.98
Boston	.97	.88	1.14	.71	1.02	.75	.97	1.00
Minneapolis	.97	.88	1.37	.71	.91	.50	.96	.95

TABLE 13.—COST INDEXES FOR DAY CARE INPUTS IN 30 SELECTED CITIES—Continued

	Administrators and teachers	Secretary	Janitor	Aides	Utilities and rent	Food	Transportation	Other items
Seattle	.94	.94	1.47	.71	1.05	.69	1.00	.97
Dayton	.91	.91	1.45	.71	.84	.89	.99	.90
Atlanta	.94	.90	1.02	.71	.84	.65	.89	.97
Cincinnati	.90	.86	1.24	.71	.81	.89	.93	.95
Indianapolis	.92	.90	1.27	.71	.95	.69	.96	1.00
Baton Rouge	.94	.79	.93	.71	.80	.66	.92	.93
St. Louis	.92	.90	1.30	.71	.87	.59	1.03	.94
Houston	.91	.95	.98	.71	.80	.81	.95	.93
Denver	.90	.82	1.12	.71	.79	.71	.98	.91
Nashville	.87	.92	1.07	.71	.84	.72	.91	.95
Orlando	.88	.85	1.07	.71	.95	.77	.86	.95
Kansas City	.87	.84	1.26	.71	.87	.65	1.00	.94
Dallas	.87	.90	1.00	.71	.85	.81	.90	.97
Portland, Maine	.87	.82	1.20	.71	.96	.69	.95	1.04
Wichita	.86	.81	1.15	.71	.90	.65	.86	.89

Source: Inner city fund.

TABLE 14.—WASHINGTON, D.C., INPUT COSTS FOR CENTER AND FAMILY DAY CARE

Center care	Administrators and teachers	Secretary	Janitor	Aides	Utilities and rent	Food	Transportation	Other items	Total
Infants	$1,629	$76	$58	$821	$90	$175	(1)	$100	$2,949
Toddlers	1,187	76	58	683	90	175	(1)	168	2,436
Preschool (36 to 53 mos.)	945	76	58	257	90	175	(1)	101	1,702
Preschool (54 to 71 mos.)	717	76	58	205	90	175	(1)	117	1,[illegible]8
6 to 8 years	354	42	58	133	90	105	$50	136	968
9 to 11 years	288	34	58	108	90	105	50	119	852
12 to 14 years	376	27	58	0	90	105	50	106	812
Family day care:									
Infants	(1)	(1)	(1)	1,640	(1)	175	(1)	59	1,874
Toddlers	(1)	(1)	(1)	1,230	(1)	175	(1)	50	1,455
Preschool	(1)	(1)	(1)	820	(1)	175	(1)	49	1,044
School age	(1)	(1)	(1)	582	(1)	175	50	51	788

Source: Inner city fund.

---

[1] Not applicable.

APPENDIX E

Excerpts from "Sliding Fee Schedules, a Simulation Analysis of Child Care Service and Cost Under Welfare Reform," Prepared for the Office of Child Development by Abt Associates, Inc., July 1972

A. WHAT IS A FEE SCHEDULE?

It is clear that a fee schedule is simply a formula for determining how the full cost of child care is to be shared between families using child care services and (a) public agency(ies). In practice, the fee which a family must pay under a fee schedule is usually a function of family income and almost always an increasing function of family income—i.e., the higher the income, other things equal, the more a family must pay for the same service. A fee schedule may also be a function of family size, the number of children in child care, and the full cost of child care services.

A fee schedule may take a wide variety of forms. Perhaps the simplest form for a fee schedule is the linear form; this form may be represented graphically as a straight line which connects the income level at which a minimum fee (or no fee) is charged, with the income level at which the fee charged is equal to the full cost of care. For example, consider the fee schedule in Illustration II.a. [Not included]. This schedule applies to a family using child care services worth $1,500 a year—i.e., $1,500 is the full dollar cost of the child care services this particular family is using, over a year's period. The fee schedule defines how much of that $1,500 the family must pay; this fee is clearly an increasing function of the family income. In this example, at incomes below $4,000, the family receives the service free. At incomes above $4 000, the higher the income, the higher the fee, up to an income of $10,000. Thus, at a family income of $6,000, the fee would be $500; at a family income of $8,000, the fee would be $1,000.

TABLE II.b.—EXAMPLE OF A FEE SCHEDULE

Annual family income	Annual fee to family
$0	0
$1,000	0
$2,000	0
$3,000	0
$4,000	0
$5,000	$250
$6,000	500
$7,000	750
$8,000	1,000
$9,000	1,250
$10,000 and over	1,500

At an income of $10,000, the fee this particular family must pay according to the fee schedule, is equal to the full cost of the child care service being used (i.e., $1,500). At incomes above $10,000, the fee remains at $1,500, (since any higher fee would mean that this family would be paying more than the full cost of care; Government fee schedules rarely, if ever, require a payment greater than the full cost of care).

This simple fee schedule illustrates a number of characteristics of customary fee schedules:

There is a minimum income below which no fee (or only a nominal fee) is charged to the family,

The fee does not decrease as income increases,

Over some income range, the fee increases as income increases,

Over the income range where the fee is increasing, the increase in the fee is less than the increase in income (in this example, the fee increases $25 for every $100 increase in income over the $4,000 to $10,000 income range)

At some income level above the minimum, the fee equals the full cost of care; at higher incomes, the fee remains at the full cost level.

Also, the four basic features or parameters of a fee schedule are illustrated and easily identified in this example. The parameters are:

The income level above which the service is no longer free to the family ($4,000 in the example),

The income level at which the fee to the family is equal to the full cost of the service ($10,000 in the example)

The full cost of the service ($1,500 in the example),[1]

The shape of the schedule (straight line in the example)

The shape of the curve, and any other two parameters (basic features), determines the fourth parameter. For example, once we have specified the income level above which the service is no longer free to the family ($4,000 in the example), the full cost of the service ($1,500 in the example), and the shape of the schedule (a straight line, in the example), the income level at which the fee to the family is equal to the full cost of the service *has* to be a certain number ($10,000 in the example).

If the fee schedule described above were actually to be *used* in an operating program, it would probably be presented in a table, with a particular fee specified for various income ranges. While such a table is not exactly the same as the schedule displayed above, it is close enough for practical purposes. For example, the above fee schedule might be represented in a table such as the following:

---

[1] Thus, any fee schedule may be said to be a function of the full cost of care. Some analysts have attempted to distinguish between schedules which are only functions of income and schedules which are functions of income and cost. This distinction does not apply to fee schedules under consideration here, since a basic requirement of H.R. 1 fee schedules is that they continue to increase with income until the full cost of care is reached.

TABLE II.C.—FEE SCHEDULE TABLE, FOR ADMINISTRATION OF FEE SCHEDULE[1]

Annual family income	Fee to family	
	Weekly	Yearly
0 to $3,999	0	0
$4,000 to $4,199	$1.00	$50
$4,200 to $4,399	2.00	100
$4,400 to $4,599	3.00	150
$4,600 to $4,799	4.00	200
$4,800 to $4,999	5.00	250
$5,000 to $5,199	6.00	300
$5,200 to $5,399	7.00	350
$5,400 to $5,599	8.00	400
$5,600 to $5,799	9.00	450
$5,800 to $5,999	10.00	500
$6,000 to $6,199	11.00	550
$6,200 to $6,399	12.00	600
$6,400 to $6,599	13.00	650
$6,600 to $6,799	14.00	700
$6,800 to $6,999	15.00	750
$7,000 to $7,199	16.00	800
$7,200 to $7,399	17.00	850
$7,400 to $7,599	18.00	900
$7,600 to $7,799	19.00	950
$7,800 to $7,999	20.00	1,000
$8,000 to $8,199	21.00	1,050
$8,200 to $8,399	22.00	1,100
$8,400 to $8,599	23.00	1,150
$8,600 to $8,799	24.00	1,200
$8,800 to $8,999	25.00	1,250
$9,000 to $9,199	26.00	1,300
$9,200 to $9,399	27.00	1,350
$9,400 to $9,599	28.00	1,400
$9,600 to $9,799	29.00	1,450
$9,800 to $9,999	30.00	1,500
$10,000 and over	30.00	1,500

---

[1] Assuming care provided for 50 weeks per year, leaving 2 weeks for vacation.

Technically speaking, this table represents a "step" function. Any fee schedule may be approximated by such a table, for purposes of administration; the federal income tax tables are a familiar example. Our example of a fee schedule illustrates still another obvious but important characteristic of customary schedules; over a wide range of income (0 to $10,000 in the example), the family pays less than the full cost of care; the difference between full cost and what the family pays is, in government sponsored programs, paid by the government. The sum of what families pay and what the government pays is equal to the full cost of care. We can augment Table II.b to show the government cost schedule corresponding to our exemplary fee schedule: [1]

TABLE II-d.—GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTION TO COST [1] OF CARE

Annual family income	Annual fee to family	Government contribution
$0	$0	$1,500
1,000	0	1,500
2,000	0	1,500
3,000	0	1,500
4,000	0	1,500
5,000	250	1,250
6,000	500	1,000
7,000	750	750
8,000	1,000	500
9,000	1,250	250
10,000	1,500	0
11,000	1,500	0
12,000	1,500	0

[1] Full cost equals $1,500.

Note: This table serves as a reminder that a fee schedule is simply a *formula* for determining how the full cost of child care is to be shared between families using child care services and the Federal Government. A fee schedule, *per se*, implies nothing about the *administrative mechanism* by which money is transferred from families and/or the government to the provider of child care services. *A very important consequence of this observation is the realization that the income disregard mechanism for government subsidy of child care is, in fact, just a particular kind of fee schedule—but one which is associated with a particular kind of administrative mechanism.* (See section D, Direct Payment Mechanism vs. Income Disregard.) It is the *mechanism* of the disregard which makes that particular type of fee schedule interesting, *not* the particular cost-sharing formula which has been chosen.

Most fee schedules are more complicated than the simple one discussed above. Two major factors contribute to this complexity:

Family characteristics—fee schedules may be adjusted for certain family characteristics, such as family size, number of children in the family requiring child care services, and the ages of the children needing child care services.

Fee schedules designed to charge families according to their ability to pay often include an adjustment for family characteristics. Assuming that family income is the best index of family ability to pay, it is commonly believed that, for any given income, the larger the family the less that family is "able" to pay for child care. Thus, it might be appropriate to use a different fee schedule for families of different sizes, such that at any given family income, the larger the family the lower the fee charged.

Of course, the number and ages of children in a family who require child care will be an important factor in determining the full cost of child care services for the family. Frequently, adjustments are made in fee schedules to effect equity among families having different numbers of children and/or children of different ages. Thus, for example, fee schedules could be designed so that a family of four with two children in child care would not have to pay twice the fee of a similar family with only one child in child care. Or, a family of three with an infant in child care might not have to pay a higher fee than a family of three with a school-age child in child care, at any given income.[2] One way to take account of the age and number of children in a family is to set the minimum income for eligible families and the shape of the fee schedule, and allow the full cost of child care for the family to determine the family income level at which the fee to the family would equal the full cost (at which the Government no longer subsidizes).

The shape of the fee schedule.—The fee schedule need not be linear. In fact, there are some good arguments for using non-linear, (concave) curves, rather than straight lines, in designing a fee schedule.

Non-linear, concave curves have the advantage of charging families with low incomes a smaller marginal fee per additional dollar earned than a straight line with the same end points. Of course, this means that families with relatively high incomes are charged a larger marginal fee, per additional dollar.

B. WHY HAVE A FEE SCHEDULE?

Benefits from fee schedules have been discussed by a number of writers.[3] Three principal reasons are frequently cited for using a fee schedule in the provision of child care services under H.R. 1; a fee schedule can

Allocate scarce resources in an objective fashion, in such a way as to spread the benefit of limited resources.

Avoid disincentives for families to increase their incomes (i.e., avoid "notch" effects).

Achieve equity among families of certain similarities.

Allocating Scarce Resources

Assuming that there are not sufficient funds to completely subsidize child care services for all H.R. 1 eligible families, a well-designed fee schedule is a good way of serving as many families as possible by requiring the financial participation of families who can pay part of their costs. With any given Government budget for child care, if child care were free to some families (fully-subsidized) and full-cost to all others, (not subsidized), some Government funds would be unnecessarily wasted and some families would not participate who need partial subsidy to participate. This is because some of the families receiving full subsidy would in all probability have been willing to pay *some* part of their cost. Also some families who did not participate probably would have done so with a partial subsidy. The likely greater efficiency in the use of Government dollars for child care is a major reason for introducing fee scales.

---

[2] Care for an infant is generally more expensive than care for a school-age child.

[3] For a detailed discussion of the reasons for fee schedules, see Mary Siegel's "Issue Paper for Fee Schedules," from the FAP–IM office (June 30, 1971) and Terence Kelly's Urban Institute (draft) paper "Fee Schedules and Social Services."

Avoid Disincentives

A properly designed fee schedule should result in a family being better off financially by working rather than not working, or by working more rather than working less.

Achieve Equity

A properly designed fee schedule can result in the same treatment of families in the same situation (horizontal equity) and the treatment of families in different situations in a way which is generally agreed to be fair (vertical equity).

APPENDIX F

Excerpts From "Regulations of Early Childhood Programs"

(By Gwen C. Morgan, Child Care Consultant, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, 1973)

Introduction

As this country inches its way toward greater support of programs for young children, there is concern over the quality of those programs. The White House Conference on Children and Youth, for example, voted day care as its "overriding concern;" the wording of the resolution and the Forum Paper on Developmental Day Care [1] make clear that it is speaking of a quality program in which the staff makes a positive contribution to the growth of the children and the strength of their families. Children are too important to be allowed to vegetate in poor programs. There is an overwhelming desire to insist, require, demand that the programs be good ones. At the same time there is both ambivalence and confusion about the various methods of regulation which are open to us.

The situation is pretty well illustrated by the experience of the Dean of the University of Michigan. Numerous students there need day care services in order to continue their studies. The university, as a state agency, is not subject to licensing, yet it is accountable for a level of quality control on a par with Michigan standards. A building was found which was in fact superior to the housing in which the parents and children lived, but it did not meet the state's safety requirements. While wrestling with this dilemma, the university discovered that to obtain Federal funds, both to improve the building and for the program in general, it would also have to meet Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements. One of these requirements was that the program meet the state's requirements for licensing.

Curious to discover who in Washington was responsible, Dean Cohen discovered his own signature on the document, dating from his days as Acting Secretary of HEW. He could only conclude that "Things look different in Ann Arbor than they do in Washington."

The dean had come face to face with four of the different forms of regulation of day care; state licensing, building safety inspection, federal funding requirements, and the administrative accountability of a state agency, in this case, the university.

* * * * * * *

---

[1] White House Conference on Children, *Report to the President,* Forum 17 Washington, December, 1970).

History

During the Civil War and directly afterward, national concern for children in a period of national upheaval led to more formal regulatory approaches to child care. In New England, concern for "little wanderers" or groups of homeless children led to the creation of a board of charities in 1863 in Massachusetts to inspect and report on child care facilities of certain types. Other states followed suit in the next decade.

History provides clear reasons for such actions. During the period between 1750 and 1850, in Europe, a major check on population growth was infanticide.[4] As an alternative, the major cities developed large foundling institutions. However, these, too, were regarded by the public as only a more humane form of infanticide, offering a chance for survival to a few children. When the London Foundling Hospital was opened in 1741, it was met with overwhelming numbers of babies, who were left in a basket equipped with a bell outside the gate. In the first four years nearly 15,000 children were accepted. Only 4,000 of the foundlings lived to adolescence, which was rather a high rate of survival in comparison with other similar hospitals. Outside the city, baby farming was a scandalous social practice and many babies were murdered. In 1872, Parliament finally passed an act requiring baby farms to have a special license and to maintain full accounts of their admissions and deaths.

Equally shocking conditions existed on the continent. In France, in one decade (1824–1833) 336,297 infants were abandoned to French hospices, and local authorities were struggling with the volume and the expense. Mortality was extremely high and the general public was appalled. One writer, Langer, suggested that the hospices post a sign declaring "Children killed at government expenses."[5]

The same problems existed on this side of the Atlantic, and the same public concern was aroused for the same clear, overpowering reasons. Foundlings in stitutions were not surviving. According to an early observer, ". . . in 1868, at the great Foundlings' Hospital on Wards Island, near New York, 1,527 children were received in 11 months, and all died within the first year but 80 . . . and . . . these . . . have small chance for life." At the state Almshouse in Tewksbury, Massachusetts, ". . where 153 motherless infants only were admitted in 5 years ending 1873, *all died but 15.*"[6]

During the 19th century states were providing subsidies to private agencies for the care of children, and public scandals over the abuse of children in these institutions brought about public support for controls, similar to federal funding standards and monitoring today.

The first licensing law was passed in 1885 in Pennsylvania, regulating care of children by private individuals. The law required a license and imposed penalties for failure to comply. Other states followed suit, and as early as 1909, Indiana required licensing for boarding homes and institutions for children. These early laws were weak and poorly enforced, but as the quality of child care in the voluntary sector improved, the states could begin to require quality beyond the mere elimination of deaths and blatant abuse. These early beginnings were strengthened by federal government support for child welfare services in the Social Security Act of 1935 and by the Children's Bureau activities since 1960, in getting state day care licensing laws passed. From these, present regulatory activities have grown, more by circumstance than by design.

---

[4] William L. Langer, "Checks on Population Growth: 1750–1850," *Scientific American* (February 1972).

[5] Ibid.

[6] Henry W. Lord, "Dependent and Delinquent Children, With Special Reference to Girls," *Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Conference of Charities* (Boston: A. Williams & Co., 1878), p. 171.

Some General Problems

There is, at present, some national confusion over the different forms of regulation and over what is regulation and what is not. Neither the public nor the professionals are always clear on the distinctions between different forms of regulation. For instance, they may not know how licensing requirements and administrative guidelines are different from federal funding requirements.

The relationship of child care regulation to child placement is almost hopelessly muddled. The relationship between supervision and consultation leads to some confusion. The distinction between consultation which is appropriate from a regulatory office and technical assistance in program development is not always made, and as a result, licensing people become involved in activities more appropriate for program people.

The direct relationship between standards and costs is ignored. One set of people believes that "If you really care about children and their families you will pay whatever it costs for good service." while another set of people believe that, "If you really care about children and their families, you will remove unrealistic obstacles which overprotect a few children and leave the rest on the streets." Some kind of emotional bias makes it impossible for most people to think rationally about what would be the best service at the most feasible cost to serve the most children.

Our ambivalence is extreme. For ourselves and our creative, innovative programs we want freedom and autonomy. For the lady down the block who is trying to make a living in caring for other people's children, we may want tight control and perhaps program extermination.

We find it very difficult to plan a delivery system for children which really involves a number of different auspices. In discussion of standards, we tend to impose administrative guidelines for federally funded programs on programs which use no federal dollars at all without consciously making the distinction. There is a vast difference between designing a delivery system which uses only one source of funds and mobilizing all the public and private resources for children in a community, but we forget the difference when we talk about standards.

Finally, those involved in child care regulation are seldom offered in-service training and almost never receive any academic course work in the subject. The Children's Bureau, having successfully achieved state licensing legislation, did not follow up to stimulate training. Too often, licensing workers learn how to do their job by finding out how others have done it in the past, by getting some quick advice from their colleagues, and by guesswork. The New England Licensing Association is the only such organization in the country. It is small wonder that there is a lack of clarity in the country on licensing and regulation.

* * * * * * *

Major Forms of Regulation

* * * * * * *

Federal Interagency Requirements

Another form of direct regulation is the establishment of funding standards to govern the quality of services for which the government is willing to pay. Federal Interagency Requirements represent this form and apply to any program using any federal money. In the 1968 development of these requirements a commendable effort was made to achieve the same quality of services for children in day care, regardless of which federal agency provided the funds. These requirements prevent such divergencies as a custodial program in one agency, an educational program in another agency, and a developmental program in still another. The point is that, regardless of auspices and regardless of the reasons for establishing the service, the basic needs which all children share must be met. The quality of the services must be independent of the agency providing the funds. Funding standards provide another form of regulation and another level of quality above the basic floor protection represented by licensing.

There is, however, confusion about the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements. There is not a clear distinction between licensing requirements, on the one hand, and administrative guidelines, on the other. There is no reason why funding standards, which are designed for appropriate use of public funds should necessarily be the same as licensing requirements, which are designed for the protection of all children. Yet, in some states, my own included, well-meaning professionals have attempted to "bring licensing requirements in line" with the Federal Interagency Requirements. This activity results in having the state impose the same requirements on programs which have no public funds as the federal government imposes for purchase of services it considers high quality and suitable for public expenditure. The result is that private proprietors, who still provide more than half the day care in my state, feel very threatened by the Federal Interagency Requirements which should not apply to them in any way. Many proprietors have gone to a good deal of expense and effort to meet state licensing requirements. Imposing more stringent standards on them without subsidy will be likely to drive them out of business. Therefore, they are inclined to oppose publicly funded day care altogether and their support of licensing, painfully won over ten years, has been seriously eroded.

Even when it is clear that federal standards will not be imposed on programs using no federal funds, the standards pose a problem for the independent proprietor who is accustomed to taking in a few welfare-funded children. For this reason, one program director, explaining why she had decided against including welfare children in her program, said:

> To meet the federal requirements I would have to change my whole program, hire more staff and provide additional social services. Our school is expensive enough as it is ($48/month for a five day week of 2½ hour sessions). If say one-third of our children were from AFDC homes and we were receiving public funds for them, we would still have to increase parental funds by 25% or more. The public funds would only cover the cost of providing for the AFDC children, but according to the regulations the *whole program* must be run in the

same way. The added expense in doing this makes it a real sacrifice, one which I am not prepared to make.[9]

The issues here are two. How many children who are publicly subsidized does a program have to include before the federal funding standards apply? And second, must the standards apply to the care of all the children or only to the publicly subsidized ones?

Also confusing is the relation of the federal funding requirements to administrative guidelines, particularly for Head Start, or for new day [illegible] about which people are very concerned. As noted earlier, Federal Interagency Requirements apply to any program using any federal money; an example is the purchase of care for one child who is poor in a parent cooperative day care program which is otherwise funded privately. Some, whose experience has been entirely with publicly funded programs, are likely to push hard to get some cherished guidelines included in the Interagency Requirements. Writing the federal requirements as if they were the Head Start guidelines would impose a bureaucratic set up and a rigid program mold on the schools, on welfare-funded child care, on privately operated programs which take in a few subsidized children. The loss in diversity and variety would be greater than the gain in quality.

If they choose to do so, states, too, could establish their own funding standards, which might be of higher quality than licensing requirements. In the case of in-home day care, which is not licensed, state welfare departments are required by the federal government to develop their own funding standards for in-home care, which seems strange when in-home care might have been included in the Federal Interagency Requirements. It is not quite clear why it was left out. Perhaps the nation is less interested in the quality of the care it purchases from a baby sitter than that which it purchases in centers or in family day care. Whether that is the reason or whether it simply reflects the national confusion about the difference between licensing and funding standards is not clear.

* * * * * * *

Staff Credentialing and Its Relation to Adult-Child Ratio

In public education, and in many other fields of professional work, there are methods for the credentialing of staff. The rigidity of these methods is well-known, and the early childhood programs have not wished to build a system on this model.

Generally, staff in the early childhood field have had to meet very few rigid requirements. Requirements come in state licensing regulations and in funding standards, neither of which involves a high degree of academic certification. The early childhood field recognizes that the academic system does not necessarily produce a good staff person and, conversely, that many good staff people have no academic credentials.

However, to make this statement is not to dismiss training and education of staff. In-service training of all staff should be continuous in day care and early childhood programs. Probably both licensing and funding regulation should in the future specify training requirements, and funds should be available to pay for training. To be valuable much of the training will take place not in the academic setting but in the day care setting where general principles can be linked directly to concrete experience.

---

[9] Particia Gerald Bourne, Elliott A. Medrich, Louise Steadwell, and Donald Barr, *Day Care Nightmare—A Child Centered View of Child Care* (Berkeley: University of California, Institute of Urban and Regional Development, 1971).

Training should carry course credit. There is an urgent need for all our academic systems to work together to develop equivalencies, so that staff training credit can add up in the end to academic credit. Establishing this relationship requires that in-service training courses carry credit acceptable to our community college system; that the community college work be equivalent to that required in the four-year institutions; and that a bridge to the academic route to certification be built. Not everybody will want to walk on that bridge, but its existence will give meaning to the system.

A position of Child Care Associate needs to be created on the career ladder in child care. New ways of credentialing, which take into account the performance of people, as well as their academic standing, need to be discussed. The Office of Child Development is investigating a federal credentialing system. A task force in Massachusetts,[20] appointed by the state 4–C Committee, is recommending a method of state credentialing based on field evaluation of successful performance with children. The members of the task force opposed federal credentialing because of the need for the credential to have broad transferability across systems. Any credentialing needs to be linked to state licensing requirements. A further recommendation of the task force is the formation of a consortium of colleges and community colleges, under the leadership of the state's university, to begin at once the hard work of establishing equivalencies and transferability of course work done in this field. There should also be some way of mandating parent input into professional training, as a way of improving that training.

A regulation which would also affect credentialing is a required curriculum for the child care programs. The emphasis in the field of child development is generally away from the curricula in the sense in which the word is used in public education and toward a prepared environment and trained, sensitive interaction of staff with children. This approach places the emphasis on staff development rather than on prepackaged curriculum.

Closely related to staff credentials is staff-child ratio and this is the overriding issue in day care generally. It is a central issue for two reasons: (1) it is the key to quality; and (2) it is the key to costs.

Setting staff-child ratio standards is extraordinarily difficult. It is also extraordinarily important. If there is not enough staff to respond to and interact with the children as individuals, the program will fall into institutional solutions that will have harmful effects on the children. These effects are real and have been measured.

Traditional approaches have been to protect children from these potential dangers by requiring a fairly low staff-child ratio. If the ratio is well within the limits, the program is not doing harm.

In the past the child-staff ratio has been determined by using an arbitrary figure for an age peer group. However, this method does not take into account a number of factors which should influence child-staff ratio. For example, the following have an important bearing on optimum child-staff ratio: (1) the fact that the children in a group are not necessarily all going to be the same age; (2) the time of day and the type of activity; (3) the size of the center (it is easier to do a good job with fewer staff in a small center where everyone knows everyone else well); (4) the number of children in the program who have some special need; (5) the type of program (for example, drop-in centers may require more staff); and (6) the involvement of parents and the community.

---

[20] Mellissa Tillman, Helen Steinberg, et al., Report of the Task Force on Staff Development, In draft (Massachusetts: 4–C Committee, 1972).

Related to child-staff ratio is cost of the program. The effects of a low child-adult ratio is a high cost per child. Therefore, at present quality day care is available only to the rich, who can pay the cost, or to the poor, whom the government and private charity will subsidize. Statistically, the greatest need in day care is among those families in which the mother is already working, but the total family income, in the $6000 to $8000 range (sometimes even with two employed parents), puts quality care out of reach. This group, when it has day care at all, receives the poorest quality of service and pays the highest cost.[21]

* * * * * * *

Power Base of the Forms of Regulations

* * * * * * *

Funding requirements

Programs can be funded in several ways, and the power base for regulation is slightly different in each case. The three forms of purchase of care which are used are (1) vendor payments for the care of an individual child; (2) vouchers, which are the same thing in slightly different form; and (3) contracting.

Vendor Payments—The power of the administering agency is that it can withhold money or try to get past payments back, if the program does not meet requirements. We have a good deal of experience with vendor payments, and the power of the administrator is very limited. At present, in a seller's market, the provider pretty much calls the tune. The administrator's best course is to get a mutual agreement about the level of quality before purchasing the care. Power is shared between the administrator and the provider. Experience with the Work Incentive program and predecessor training programs in welfare departments indicates that this method of purchase of care is often associated with quite low quality.

The vendor payment type of funding provides the administrator, in theory, with a potential power base for enforcement procedures. His effectiveness is also limited by the presence of a seller's market.

Vouchers—Vouchers are very similar to the long-established vendor payments. They are individual reimbursement for service to parents or for services selected by parents. Our long experience with vendor payments indicates that this method, too, is likely to result in low quality unless accompanied by other forms of assistance and regulation.

There are some planners who are impatient with the frustrations of our regulatory systems. Such people see vouchers as a solution, simply because they seem to offer parent choice without regulation. The advantages of parent choice are, of course, very attractive, but our experience with vendor payments indicates that inadequate regulation is unwise.

Vouchers are very useful in certain situations, and in instances where there is an existing service, they will help to "buy in" a particular group of children. They are less useful as a way of creating a new service. And they are alarming if seen as a substitute for accountability and planning.

---

[21] Mildred Guberman, et al, *Cost Analysis in Day Care Centers* (Waltham, Massachusetts: Brandeis University, 1967)

The disadvantages of vouchers are that they encourage a lack of stability in publicly funded programs which badly need some stability and continuity. Further, in our urban areas they open the door to massive manipulation of parents by commercial and other special interest groups.

Of course, in reality, there is no way to avoid regulation when public accountability for public funds is involved, and there is no question that the bureaucracy will be protecting itself by tying all kinds of strings to the use of vouchers. However, the power base for enforcement is extremely weak.

Contracting for Service—The power base here, theoretically, is very broad, and there are no legal limits involved. The administrative agency decides what will be purchased and writes rules to cover that service. However, in reality, there are some substantial limitations on what the agency can require. If the rule-maker writes rules that exceed funding for their enforcement, the rules will be flaunted, and conflict will develop. The federal interagency requirements are an example of this kind of rule-making. In theory, contracting offers more power than licensing, because contracted regulations are accompanied by a subsidy to pay for them. However, unless it is carefully used with an understanding of the relation between standards and costs and unless there is a method of monitoring, this method will be weaker than licensing, whose goals are more modest. In other words, ignoring the limits of the power base will weaken the power.

Licensing

Licensing derives its power from the delegated authority of legislatures. Like the legislators, it must be responsive to the public will. Its power is legal but ultimately rests on a political base.

Wisely used, licensing can enforce a level of quality. However, enforceability involves a number of considerations other than desirable practice. For licensing to be enforceable, there must be a number of people willing and able to meet the requirements, so that it will be possible over time to close out facilities unwilling or unable to comply. Availability of funds, trained staff, and the opinion of the community also determine at any given moment how much power the licensing authority really has. If the licensing office is extremely sensitive to the limits of its power and the need to use its powers fairly, these powers are considerable.

One of the greatest problems of enforcement in licensing involves staff. While licensing staff have considerable skill in working for voluntary compliance, they have little training or background in legal enforcement.[23] Legal enforcement requires a lawyer's skills in building up a case. In licensing we need to develop procedures and establish records which would be useful in enforcement even if they are never used. To do so, licensing workers need to record and preserve matters which will be admissible evidence in court. Such a file would include, according to Benjamin P. Alschuler, the following:

> . . . records of periodic or frequent visits, other than licensing visits and records, followed by documentation in a letter to the operator or owner of your findings, and mailed to the licensee by certified mail with a return receipt requested or the operator may plead, "Nobody told me." [23]

---

[23] Benjamin P. Alschuler, "The Enforcement Power of Law," *Licensing Power* (Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1971), pp. 37-38.

These records will be the basis for charges which will "stand up in court" should such charges have to be made. Those things which will stand up in court, again according to Benjamin Alschuler, are as follows:

> The statement of charges begins with specific complaints and then moves into the specific incidents and violations, tying them to the specific references in the Standards. Police records can be subpoenaed as evidence. Records of past convictions can also be subpoenaed as evidence.[23]

Keeping these kind of records may also prove useful from time to time in defending a program against some unwarranted attack from sources other than licensing.

As a preventive service with a strong enforcement power base, licensing needs to develop its standards while encouraging wide public awareness and keeping an ear open to public concerns. The licensing laws passed in the early sixties were to prevent harm to children in day care. Now, the public is balancing that interest against its awareness of harm being done to children because they are *not* in day care. A responsibility to prevent harm to these children, too, affects the public thinking about day care. If, in its zeal to protect the children in day care, the licensing authority forgets the many interests which must be balanced, it will find itself without public support.

Another consideration related to the power base of licensing involves conditions that adversely affect the licensing concept. Consider the following conditions:

1. *Private interests* trying to convince Congress that licensing is the one obstacle to the growth of a needed service.

2. *Poor licensing concepts and practices,* such as discrimination against certain types of centers, which would provide evidence tending to corroborate the testimony against licensing by the first group.

3. *The proponents of licensing and the child care experts* who fail to engage public support and who go beyond what the public will accept. An example in my state was an attempt to change standards to require a master's degree of all day care directors.

4. *Consumers in public programs* and administrators of those programs, who are confused about the difference between licensing and administrative guidelines. If there are standards which they consider important for their program, they may attempt to impose such standards on all private programs through licensing. If all the various segments of the population concerned to do accept such standards, they can defeat the licensing process. Independent proprietors will act through their legislators to destroy licensing laws. As stated earlier, premature attemps to use licensing to raise quality will undoubtedly destroy the most important function of licensing, i.e., enforcing an acceptable level of quality.

If licensing can enforce a level of quality, how might one proceed to raise that level without disrupting the power base of enforcement that licensing provides. One way may be a more effective process for forming standards. Since a number of different interests participate in licensing of day care, these interests should be included in forming standards. Among those who should participate in the process are the following:

1. *Representatives of other regulatory agencies whose* standards must be consistent with those of the licensing authority.

---

[23] Ibid.

2. *Child care experts.*
3. *Licensees,* including the proprietors, who may see standards as confiscatory, and the voluntary sector, who may see them as interfering with the rights of citizens to get together and meet a perceived need.
4. *All other state agencies which provide* or seek to provide child care services, because they will wish to adopt equitable standards themselves and, therefore, will be affected by the standards.
5. *Users of child care.*
6. *Interested citizens.*

All these groups need to be involved in the development of standards, on the legal principle of interest representation. Their involvement should be widespread both in terms of representation and in terms of participation. A number of phases have been suggested [24] involving exploration, initial draft, committee meetings to discuss the draft, revised draft, series of public hearings, final draft, and finally, adoption and promulgation which is the sole responsibility of the licensing authority. This process is time-consuming and, if done correctly, will probably take about one year. The investment of time is a wise one.

It is only during the process of formation of standards, that the public is truly involved in exploring what they want for their children. At present a "creative tension exists between poverty organizations who press for personal qualifications and education professionals who press for academic qualifications." [25] Needs of urban areas and rural areas are very different. The young will have ideas different from the established. Changing life styles bring new interests into the child care picture and raise questions about the role of the state in regulating parents' efforts to find new ways to share child-rearing. Any attempts to impose one set of ideas on all these different interests without lengthy discussion will fail. But worse than that, failure will mean the loss of the one best opportunity for different groups to educate and learn from one another and to build a solid power base in support of the quality they finally agree is needed for their children.

* * * * * * *

Day Care Licensing

The preceding discussion presented the underlying power base for the various forms of regulations and the constraints on the enforceability of each. The following takes a broader look at the licensing forms of regulation.

A thorny problem in this area is writing regulations. There appear to be two schools of thought on writing regulations. One group feels that rules should be broad and general and that licensing staff should interpret the rules according to the particular set of circumstances in each program. The second group feels that rules should be specific.

Bernard Stumbras of the Wisconsin Welfare Department is a strong advocate of specificity in regulations. He finds the general rules unacceptable, especially "when practiced on me." [28] According to Stumbras, the provider who must deal with unclear regulations is merely a puppet waiting for the master's command. The broad wording allows the government agency to engage reinterpretations that emasculate the front-line rule-enforcer. The rule-enforcer is never sure how the rulemaker is going to interpret a regulation.

---

[24] Norris Class, *Licensing of Child Care Facilities by State Welfare Departments,* (Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1968), p. 30.

[25] Patricia Gerald Bourne, Elliott Medrich, Louis Steadwell, and Donald Barr, *Day Care Nightmare—A Child-Centered View of Child Care* (Berkeley: University of California, Institute of Urban and Regional Development) pp. 87–88.

[28] Bernard Stumbras, Delivery of Services in a Regulated Society, Unpublished paper (Milwaukee: University of Wisconsin, 1971).

Stumbras feels that for licensing regulations (and other rules) to be effective they must meet the following requirements:

1. Understandable to any citizen.
2. Specific enough that any person knows what is to be done and what is not to be done.
3. Enforceable in that they are capable of measurement.
4. Complete enough that they offer necessary protection.

Stumbras feels that rules must be honest, measureable, and clear and must foster mutual trust between the rulemakers and the regulated. It seems clear that the legal profession, too, will strongly support this second point of view.

Specific rules are difficult to write and, once written, leave the rulemakers, as Stumbras puts it, "no place to hide." It is particularly difficult to write rules covering those aspects of the program which are considered most important—the intangible qualities. For example, it is very hard to describe and measure the quality of an adult-child relationship. Is the adult tuned in to the child's idiosyncratic growth pattern (or, in other words, does the adult know and care who the child is)? Federal legislation is full of vague descriptions. "There shall be adequate privacy." Or, "Staff shall have warmth." These kinds of requirements are either unenforceable or create adversaries among levels of government as interpretations shift.

The best approach is to determine the specific behaviour which is most likely to produce or signify the designated quality and translate that information into the regulative format.

The need to state requirements in specific terms has some risk as it often gives rise to the popular notion that licensing is concerned only with the physical or the trivial. A good example of this misconception is bill S. 2007, the Comprehensive Child Development Act, which President Nixon vetoed. In this bill there were two sections relating to standards. Section 534 has to do with the federal funding standards, and Section 535 has to do with licensing. An analysis of the two sections reveals many conceptual problems. The bill seems to assume that the federal funding standards have to do with program, while the licensing standards have to do with health and safety. These assumptions, are, of course, incorrect.

Section 534 directs the federal government to adopt the 1968 federal interagency standards. The federal interagency standards are by no means the ultimate and there has been a great deal of discussion about revisions. In any case it is not sound to try to write standards into the law for reasons cited earlier. It would be better to direct the Federal Panel on Early Childhood to form a representative national committee, produce standards, hold hearings, and circulate drafts for comment for one year.

Section 535 seems to be directed toward licensing and seems very confused. First, it defines state licensing in terms of physical health and safety, while in reality state licensing includes all aspects of a program. In fact, physical safety and sanitation are regulated, in most cases, through statutes and regulatory systems which are outside child care licensing.

Second, Section 535(c) says that the Secretary shall "promulgate standards" which shall be applicable to all programs receiving federal financial assistance. This directive seems to be an attempt to create a federal licensing system. Although licensing is regulation of the private sector and should apply equally to all children, this federal licensing appears to be limited to federally funded programs. In addition, this requirement for establishing standards is a strange duplication of the requirement of federal funding standards in Section 534.

Finally, this section directs the Secretary to "urge their adoption" (that is, the standards) by states and local governments, apparently with the intention of making codes uniform. It would be helpful for the Secretary to develop model codes and urge their adoption by states, but misunderstandings about licensing must be cleared up first. Licensing deals with intangible qualities as well as physical qualities, and standards must encompass both.

A further risk of specificity is writing regulations in a way that will not inhibit the growth of new program forms, some of which we cannot even conceptualize at present. If the regulations are developed out of a preconceived idea of program form, they will be very rigid and will enforce the uniformity of a few models. For example, numbers of children and adult-child ratio are expressed in terms of an age-segregated model. Yet, an age-segregated model is not necessarily the only desirable program form. What is the program which uses family groupings to do? It might be ruled that the adult-child ratio should be that required for the youngest child in the group. However, the program designer's goal might be to develop a program in which younger children are helped by older children as a way of changing staffing patterns, and his design will be thwarted by the regulation.

Regulations for infants often appear to be designed for large institutions. What about the small day care program which plans to include only three infants who are the younger siblings of the older preschoolers? The requirements may be unduly rigid because of the assumptions about program form on which they are based.

This problem can be illustrated further by looking at existing regulations for group day care and trying to figure out how they might be applied to the Swedish "together center" idea.[29] Advocates of this program model, as well as many others in our society,[30] deplore the age segregation imposed by the traditional day care center. These people propose as an alternative model a program which would serve all ages. Preschool children would be cared for there; mothers would have a place to meet and drink coffee or do laundry or mending; the elderly would have hobby rooms; and in the afternoon the school-aged children would use the same hobby rooms. The opportunities for cross-age helping are great, and it is likely that such a center, if it existed, would begin to develop all kinds of creative linkages. One can imagine the center providing take-home meals for busy parents, such as single-parent fathers. Some day the preschoolers might sell the products of their bakery efforts or pudding making. The elderly might do some mending for the younger families. Children would have an opportunity to become interested in the activities of members of their community, and one can imagine an attachment between young children and "special" elderly people, or teenagers, who hobbies or work interests the children. Under these circumstances, how is one to determine where adult-child ratio leaves off and program begins?

---

[29] Marianne Karre, Swedish Information Services, New York City.

[30] Urie Bronfenbrenner, et al., "Children and Parents; Together in the World." *Report to the President*, Forum 15, White House Conference on Children (Washington, 1970), p. 239.

There should be different sets of regulations for each of the more common program forms, and these should be written in such a way that they do not force programs to conform to a few set patterns.

The Special Case of Family Day Care

There are some thorny problems in licensing family day care. The traditional method is the same as for group day care. A licensing inspector visits the home and evaluates its quality in terms of promulgated standards. To do a good job of licensing family day care, some states are putting forth a large staff effort. In other states, such efforts are not feasible. The problems with this method of licensing are the following.

1. It requires large numbers of staff. If one staff person licenses fifty homes (which is by no means an ideal case load), twenty staff members will be needed for every thousand homes licensed in this way. Many state legislatures are unwilling to approve this much staff for this purpose.

2. It may not make the best use of staff time. At present, staff time is spent in routine visits to all the homes, the good and the bad. A better use of staff time would be allocating most of the time to working with "problem" homes and spending less time on those that meet the standards anyway. This method is seldom used.

3. Because there is insufficient staff and a lack of public awareness of the value of licensing, large numbers of family day care homes will probably continue to operate illegally. A gentler method of regulation might bring more of these homes into a relationship with the state so that they could be helped through newsletters, pamphlets, and equipment loans and in other ways.

4. According to a study done in Michigan,[31] both parents and service providers see licensing as an unwelcome intrusion. Neither party views the licensing staff person as a helper. The Michigan study concluded that the family day care mother is a key person in our child care system, and better ways are needed to reach her and to help her understand the importance of her role.

5. This kind of licensing often appears to be discriminatory. As the state tries to license family day care homes, it arouses the hostility of consumers who are satisfied with their arrangements. A group of Welfare mothers in Massachusetts made some very cogent points in this regard. Since the federal requirement that the service meet licensing requirements could endanger the state's federal funding, these mothers assumed, probably correctly, that the state would be especially diligent about licensing any family day care which it purchased with federal funds. Without sufficient staff, therefore, the middle class would not be reached at all. The Welfare mothers felt that once more the government would be engaged in discriminatory policies. Regulations would apply to the poor, while those who are not poor would suffer no interference. One could argue that this discrimination favors the poor, because they would receive extra protection. However, the consumers didn't see it that way. They saw it as an inhibition of their civil liberties or a loss of freedom to choose their own arrangement for their children. They recognized the federal government's right to impose requirements on its expenditure of funds, but they would not accept licensing unless it were enforced with equal diligence for all classes. They were right in their assumption that staff was not available to provide this enforcement.

---

[31] Hicks, et al.

6. This method of licensing does not guarantee quality. There are not enough staff on the licensing team to visit these homes regularly, and without regular visitation the state cannot stand behind the guarantee of quality implied in the popular understanding of the term "licensed." Thus, by using the traditional method of licensing, the state is dishonest. It falsely designates these homes as safe places to leave children.

In addition, there are no data at present to indicate that licensed family day care homes are higher in quality than unlicensed homes. In the absence of such data and with so many pressing needs for staff, it seems unwise in some states to devote this kind of effort to a method of licensure with so many drawbacks.

Yet, a way must be found to deal with these homes. *The Day Care Nightmare* study recommended that unlicensed, regular home care must be pulled into the system, although not necessarily licensed. "We would prefer to establish linkages with a large number of unlicensed, substandard situations rather than to license a few homes. If we force universal compliance with licensing standards, service to large numbers of children will continue to be utterly unknown quantities. If, on the other hand, at least minimal links can be established, we will have created the potential for providing diagnostic and supportive services to a greatly increased number of children."[32]

Massachusetts has had some particularly difficult problems with family day care because of overlap in licensing laws between two licensing agencies—the Departments of Health and Welfare—and because the Department of Public Safety has been applying group day care center requirements to family day care homes. The result has been that Massachusetts had no legal family day care until last year, and there are now only about 200 children in licensed family day care. This number contrasts sharply with other states, where licensed homes number in the thousands.

It is of particular interest to this state, therefore, to plan ways to make the transition from no licensed homes to a regulated service. There are a good many children in homes that will need licensing or regulation in some other form. A survey done recently found that 53 percent of all Massachusetts children under the age of six are regularly cared for by someone other than the mother, outside their homes.[33] Projecting the survey percentages to 1970 census data gives a figure of 60,139 children who are regularly cared for in a home other than their own. This figure does not represent family day care, because, unfortunately, the survey design did not yield that information. It separated home-based day care from center care, but it lumped family day care with care by friends and relatives, much of which is private arrangement not requiring licensure. Yet, it is obvious that Massachusetts would have to plan for a very large staff to license family day care in the traditional way, even if only one-quarter of these out-of-home arrangements were licensable.

Present thinking in the state plans a two-pronged approach to family day care. There is a great deal of interest in encouraging the growth of family day care systems. A family day care system is a group of satellite family day care homes which operate as subparts of a total system. The system includes the homes and a central administrative core to provide recruitment of homes, training of family day care mothers, central intake, supervision and consultation, shared equipment, shared trips, a central meeting place for parents to come together with providers, and ancillary health and social services, ideally such a system would have as its heart a group day care center, which could be its model of good child care and its training center.

---

[32] Patricia G. Bourne, et al., pp. 86–87.

[33] Richard Rowe, et al., *Child Care in Massachusetts: The Public Responsibility;* Massachusetts Early Education Project: A Study of the Masachusetts Advisory Council on Education (Cambridge, 1972).

The state has already been encouraging this type of family day care instead of the independent home, and systems are beginning to be established. There are several ways to ecourage the linking up of homes into systems. First, public education can make family day care systems more visible and day care an attractive career. More status can be attached to this work through favorable publicity—without denigrating the independent home—and public interests and support will be an incentive to be part of a group. Seocnd, the state can pay more in vendor payment to the linked-up system than it would be willing to pay to the free-standing service. It can use its contracting ability as a tool to encourage agencies to recruit these homes and provide services to them.

The key to quality will be the central administrative core of the family day care system. If the agency planning the system sees the home as central (rather than the central service system) and concentrates on recruiting homes, the service is less likely to attract parents and less likely to be used. If the service can be established in relationship to an existing group center, preferably of known quality, there is great potential for training the family day care mothers, offering them a model of good care, a career ladder other related work, and status in the community. The system's reputation will assure its use, and it will have the added advantages of offering more options in its intake process.

Licensing such a service involves licensing the system as an entity, rather than issuing a separate license to each home. The licensing authority will monitor the system, and the system will make sure its member homes meet licensing requirements. A parallel situation exists in the licensing of child placement agencies which then approve the foster homes and other child welfare facilities when they operate exclusively.[34] The earlier discussion of how agencies form for assuming their public purpose is relevant here. The licensing agency must have an autonomous, accountable, legally liable entity with which to deal. In the case of the independent home, the person running the service is independent, the home can be licensed, and the home is liable. A home which is part of a family day care system is not liable: the central agency is liable. The home, as an integral part of the total service offered by the system, lacks the autonomy necessary for licensure. It must serve only children which the system admits, work within the policies of the system, be trained and approved by the system, and work under the spervision of the system.

Furthermore, if the family day care mother is an employee of the system or is under contract to the system, this relationship, which can be terminated at the will of either party, gives to the central agency the autonomy needed to be the licensable entity and to approve its member homes as subparts of itself.[35]

---

[34] There appears to be a legal parallel in this relationship, although family day care systems are not the same as child placement agencies in other ways.

[35] Edna Hughes, Elements Essential to an Effective Licensing Statute, Mimeo, p. 7. Also refer to Edna Hughes, Regulatory Methods Should Differ While Standards are the Same.

An appropriate set of requirements for family day care systems will include the same requirements already developed for independent family day care homes. In addition, an appropriate set of standards will require the central agency to arrange for certain hours of supervision and training. The group center will be inspected and licensed in the usual way, and the license to the system will allow it to approve the homes which are part of the system.

With encouragement, family day care systems will grow and will become well-known to consumers. Then, unless the operator of the independent home happens to be a friend of the consumer, family day care systems will usually be considered more reliable and will be preferred over the independent home. It is still necessary, however, to deal with the independent home in some fair way. The alternatives are few: (1) to license them, as some states are now trying to do; (2) to ignore them and hope that the encouragement of better services will eventually drive the bad ones from the field; or (3) to find an honest and workable way to regulate them. The following examines these alternatives:

1. Licensing the independent homes in Massachusetts would be a monumental task, would not reach most homes, and would arouse hostility among the public.

2. The alternative of giving up any attempt to regulate these homes has been considered seriously. The state is encouraging family day care systems, and when there are enough, the state could prohibit vendor payments to independent family day care homes. However, this approach is unfair to the good family day care and fails to protect the public from poor quality family day care homes. A parent complaining about a bad situation should be able to get the state to move on the complaint. Further, it seems hypocritical to set requirements for licensed systems but to look the other way where the independent home is concerned.

* * * * * * *

APPENDIX G

Excerpts From the Social Security Act

* * * * * * *

Title IV—Grants to States for Aid and Services to Needy Families With Children and for Child-Welfare Services

Part A—Aid to Families With Dependent Children

* * * * * * *

STATE PLANS FOR AID AND SERVICES TO NEEDY FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN

Sec. 402. (a) A State plan for aid and services to needy families with children must—

* * * * * * *

(14) provide for the development and application of a program for such family services as defined in section 406(d) and child welfare services, as defined in section 425, for each child and relative who receives aid to families with dependent children and each appropriate individual (living in the same home as a relative and child receiving such aid whose needs are taken into account in making the determination under clause (7)), as may be necessary in the light of the particular home conditions and other needs of such child, relative, and individuals, in order to assist such child, relative, and individuals to attain or retain capability for self-support and care and in order to maintain and strengthen family life and to foster child development;

(15) provide—

(A) for the development of a program for each appropriate relative and dependent child receiving aid under the plan, and each appropriate individual (living in the same home as a relative and child receiving such aid) whose needs are taken into account in making the determination under clause (7), with the objective of—

(i) assuring, to the maximum extent possible, that such relative, child, and individual will enter the labor force and accept employment so that they will become self-sufficient, and

(ii) preventing or reducing the incidence of births out of wedlock and otherwise strengthening family life,

(B) for the implementation of such programs by—

(i) assuring that such relative, child, or individual who is referred to the Secretary of Labor pursuant to clause (19) is furnished child-care services and that in all appropriate cases (including minors who can be considered to be sexually active) family planning services are offered them and are provided promptly (directly or under arrangements with others) to all individuals voluntarily requesting such services, and

(ii) in appropriate cases, providing aid to families with dependent children in the form of payments of the types described in section 406(b)(2), and

(C) that the acceptance by such child, relative, or individual of family planning services provided under the plan shall be voluntary on the part of such child, relative, or individual and shall not be a prerequisite to eligibility for or the receipt of any other service or aid under the plan,

(D) for such review of each such program as may be necessary (as frequently as may be necessary, but at least once a year) to insure that it is being effectively implemented,

(E) for furnishing the Secretary with such reports as he may specify showing the results of such programs, and

(F) to the extent that such programs under this clause or clause (14) are developed and implemented by services furnished by the staff of the State agency or the local agency administering the State plan in each of the political subdivisions of the State, for the establishing of a single organizational unit in such State or local agency, as the case may be, responsible for the furnishing of such services;

* * * * * * *

(19) provide—

(A) that every individual, as a condition of eligibility for and under this part, shall register for manpower services, training, and employment as provided by regulations of the Secretary of Labor, unless such individual is—

(i) a child who is under age 16 or attending school full time;

(ii) a person who is ill, incapacitated, or of advanced age;

(iii) a person so remote from a work incentive project that his effective participation is precluded;

(iv) a person whose presence in the home is required because of illness or incapacity of another member of the household;

(v) a mother or other relative of a child under the age of six who is caring for the child; or

(vi) the mother or other female caretaker of a child, if the father or another adult male relative is in the home and not excluded by clause (i), (ii), (iii), or (iv) of this subparagraph (unless he has failed to register as required by this subparagraph, or has been found by the Secretary of Labor under section 433(g) to have refused without good cause to participate under a work incentive program or accept employment as described in subparagraph (F) of this paragraph);

and that any individual referred to in clause (v) shall be advised of her option to register, if she so desires, pursuant to this paragraph, and shall be informed of the child care services (if any) which will be available to her in the event she should decide so to register;

* * * * * * *

(G) that the State agency will have in effect a special program which (i) will be administered by a separate administrative unit and the employees of which will, to the maximum extent feasible, perform services only in connection with the administration of such program, (ii) will provide (through arrangements with others or otherwise) for individuals who have been registered pursuant to subparagraph (A), in accordance with the order of priority listed in section 433(a), such health, vocational rehabilitation, counseling, child care, and other social and supportive services as are necessary to enable such individuals to accept employment or receive manpower training provided under part C, and will, when arrangements have been made to provide necessary supportive services, including child care, certify to the Secretary of Labor those individuals who are ready for employment or training under part C, (iii) will participate in the development of operational and employability plans under section 433(b); and (iv) provides for purposes of clause (ii), that, when more than one kind of child care is available, the mother may choose the type, but she may not refuse to accept child care services if they are available;

* * * * * * *

PAYMENT TO STATES

Sec. 403. (a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall (subject to section 1130) pay to each State which has an approved plan for aid and services to needy families with children, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing October 1, 1958—

* * * * * * *

(3) in the case of any State, an amount equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan—

(A) 75 per centum of so much of such expenditures as are for—

(i) any of the services described in clauses (14) and (15) of section 402(a) which are provided to any child or relative who is receiving aid under the plan, or to any other individual (living in the same home as such relative and child) whose needs are taken into account in making the determination under clause (7) of such section,

(ii) any of the services described in clauses (14) and (15) of 402(a) which are provided to any child or relative who is applying for aid to families with dependent children or who, within such period or periods as the Secretary may prescribe, has been or is likely to become an applicant for or recipient of such aid,

(iii) the training of personnel employed or preparing or employment by the State agency or by the local agency administering the plan in the political subdivision,

(B) one-half of the remainder of such expenditures.

The services referred to in subparagraph (A) shall include only—

(C) services provided by the staff of the State agency, or of the local agency administering the State plan in the political subdivision: *Provided*, That no funds authorized under this part shall be available for services defined as vocational rehabilitation services under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (i) which are available to individuals in need of them under programs for their rehabilitation carried on under a State plan approved under such Act, or (ii) which the State agency or agencies administering or supervising the administration of the State plan approved under such Act are able and willing to provide if reimbursed for the cost thereof pursuant to agreement under subparagraph (D), if provided by such staff, and

(D) under conditions which shall be prescribed by the Secretary, services which in the judgment of the State agency cannot be as economically or as effectively provided by the staff of such State or local agency and are not otherwise reasonably available to individuals in need of them, and which are provided, pursuant to agreement with the State agency, by the State health authority or the State agency or agencies administering or supervising the administration of the State plan for vocational rehabilitation services approved under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act or by any other State agency which the Secretary may determine to be appropriate (whether provided by its staff or by contact with public (local) or nonprofit private agencies);

except that services described in clause (ii) of subparagraph (C) hereof may be provided only pursuant to agreement with such State agency or agencies administering or supervising the administration of the State plan for vocational rehabilitation services so approved; and except that, to the extent specified by the Secretary, child-welfare services, family planning services, and family services may be provided from sources other than those referred to in subparagraphs (C) and (D). The portion of the amount expended for administration of the State plan to which subparagraph (A) applies and the portion thereof to which subparagraph (B) applies shall be determined in accordance with such methods and procedures as may be permitted by the Secretary.

* * * * * * *

(d)(1) Notwithstanding subparagraph (A) of subsection (a)(3) the rate specified in such subparagraph shall be 90 per centum (rather than 75 per centum) with respect to social and supportive services provided pursuant to section 402(a)(19)(G).

(2) Of the sums authorized by section 401 to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, not more than $750,000,000 shall be appropriated to the Secretary for payments with respect to services to which paragraph (1) applies.

PART B—CHILD WELFARE SERVICES

* * * * * * *

PAYMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 422. (a) From the sums appropriated therefor and the allotment available under this part, the Secretary shall from time to time pay to each State—

(1) that has a plan for child-welfare services which has been developed as provided in this part and which—

* * * * * * *

(C) provides, with respect to day care services (including the provision of such care) provided under this title—

(i) for cooperative arrangements with the State health authority and the State agency primarily responsible for State supervision of public schools to assure maximum utilization of such agencies in the provision of necessary health services and education for children receiving day care,

(ii) for an advisory committee, to advise the State public welfare agency on the general policy involved in the provision of day care services under the plan, which shall include among its members representatives of other State agencies concerned with day care or services related thereto and persons representative of professional or civic or other public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations, or groups concerned with the provision of day care,

(iii) for such safeguards as may be necessary to assure provision of day care under the plan only in cases in which it is in the best interest of the child and the mother and only in cases in which it is determined, under criteria established by the State, that a need for such care exists; and, in cases in which the family is able to pay part or all of the costs of such care, for payment of such fees as may be reasonable in the light of such ability,

(iv) for giving priority, in determining the existence of need for such day care, to members of low-income or other groups in the population, and to geographical areas, which have the greatest relative need for extension of such day care, and

(v) that day care provided under the plan will be provided, only in facilities (including private homes) which are licensed by the State, or approved (as meeting the standards established for such licensing) by the State agency responsible for licensing facilities of this type, and

(vi) for the development and implementation of arrangements for the more effective involvement of the parent or parents in the appropriate care of the child and the improvement of the health and development of the child.

* * * * * * *

TITLE XI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

LIMITATION ON FUNDS FOR CERTAIN SOCIAL SERVICES

SEC. 1130. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3(a) (4) and (5), 403(a)(3), 1003(a) (3) and (4), 1403(a) (3) and (4), or 1603(a) (4) and (5), amounts payable for any fiscal year (commencing with the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1972) under such section (as determined without regard to this section) to any State with respect to expenditures made after June 30, 1972, for services referred to in such section (other than the services provided pursuant to section 402(a) (19) (G)), shall be reduced by such amounts as may be necessary to assure that—

(1) the total amount paid to such State (under all of such sections) for such fiscal year for such services does not exceed the allotment of such State (as determined under subsection (b)); and

(2) of the amounts paid under all of such sections 403(a)(3) to such State for such fiscal year with respect to such expenditures, other than expenditures for—

(A) services provided to meet the needs of a child for personal care, protection, and supervision, but only in the case of a child where the provision of such services is needed (i) in order to enable a member of such child's family to accept or continue in employment or to participate in training to prepare such member for employment, or (ii) because of the death, continued absence from the home, or incapacity of the child's mother and the inability of any member of such child's family to provide adequate care and supervision for such child;

(B) family planning services;

(C) services provided to a mentally retarded individual (whether a child or an adult), but only if such services are needed (as determined in accordance with criteria prescribed by the Secretary) by such individual by reason of his condition of being mentally retarded;

(D) services provided to an individual who is a drug addict or an alcoholic, but only if such services are needed (as determined in accordance with criteria prescribed by the Secretary) by such individual as part of a program of active treatment of his condition as a drug addict or an alcoholic; and

(E) services provided to a child who is under foster care in a foster family home (as defined in section 408) or in a child-care institution (as defined in such section), or while awaiting placement in such a home or institution, but only if such services are needed (as determined in accordance with criteria prescribed by the Secretary) by such child because he is under foster care,

not more than 10 per centum thereof are paid with respect to expenditures incurred in providing services to individuals who are not recipients of aid or assistance (under the State plan approved under part A of title IV), or applicants (as defined under regulations of the Secretary) for such aid or assistance.

(b)(1) For each fiscal year (commencing with the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1972) the Secretary shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to $2,500,000,000 as the population of such State bears to the population of all the States.

(2) The allotment for each State shall be promulgated for each fiscal year by the Secretary between July 1 and August 31 of the calendar year immediately preceding such fiscal year on the basis of the population of each State and of all of the States as determined from the most recent satisfactory data available from the Department of Commerce at such time; except that the allotment for each State for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1972, and the following fiscal year shall be promulgated at the earliest practicable date after the enactment of this section but not later than January 1, 1973.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term "State" means any one of the fifty States or the District of Columbia.

APPENDIX H

Excerpts From Regulations of the Department of Health, Educatioin, and Welfare Concerning Child Care Services Under Title IV of the Social Security Act

Code of Federal Regulations, Title 45, Chapter II

* * * * * * *

Part 220—Service Programs for Families and Children; Title IV Parts A and B of Social Security Act

Subpart A—Mandatory Provisions

* * * * * * *

MANDATORY SERVICES APPLICABLE TO TITLE IV, PART A

* * * * * * *

§ 220.18 Child care services.

(a) Child care services, including in-nome and out-of-home services, must be available or provided to all persons referred to and enrolled in the Work Incentive Program and to other persons for whom the agency has required training or employment. Such care must be suitable for the individual child; and the caretaker relatives must be involved in the selection of the child care source to be used if there is more than one source available. However, when there is only one source available, the caretaker relatives must accept it unless they can show that it is unsuitable for their child. The child care services must be maintained until the caretaker relatives are reasonably able to make other satisfactory child care arrangements.

(b) Progress must be made in developing varied child care resources with the aim of affording parents a choice in the care of their children.

(c) All child care services must meet the following standards:

(1) *In-home care.* (i) Homemaker service under agency auspices must meet the standards established by the State agency which must be reasonably in accord with the recommended standards of related national standard setting organizations, such as the Child Welfare League of America and the National Council for Homemaker Services.

(ii) Child care provided by relatives, friends, or neighbors must meet standards established by the State agency that, as a minimum, cover age, physical and emotional health, capacity and time of the caretaker to provide adequate care; hours of care; maximum number of children to be cared for; feeding and health care of the children.

(2) *Out-of-home care.* Day care facilities, used for the care of children, must be licensed by the State or approved as meeting the standards for such licensing and day care facilities and services must comply with the standards of the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements and the requirements of section 422(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (see § 220.56).

(d) Both in-home and out-of-home child care provided for persons referred to the WIN program must be a service cost rather than an assistance cost.

* * * * * * *

REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO THE WORK INCENTIVE PROGRAM UNDER TITLE IV, PART A

§ 220.35 State plan requirements.

A State plan under title IV–A of the Social Security Act must provide that:

(a) Within the single organizational units required by § 220.2, there will be separate administrative units which will, to the maximum extent feasible, perform functions only in connection with the WIN program;

(b) These separate units will be responsible for:

* * * * * * *

(2) Developing self-support services plans for individuals registered pursuant to § 233.11 of this chapter when requested by the manpower agency pursuant to section 433(a) of the Act. Plans for unemployed fathers must be developed so as to permit certification within 30 days of receipt of assistance. Self-support services under the WIN program are limited to:

(i) The following mandatory services, pursuant to title IV–A of the Act and the regulations in this part: Child care, family planning, health-related services, homemaker services, home management and other functional educational service, housing improvement services, and transportation as needed to make self-support services accessible;

* * * * * * *

(4) Providing such services as are approved or added by the manpower agency in the self-support services plan, to enable the registered individual to participate in work or training activities under the WIN program. Under this requirement:

(i) Child care that is suitable to the child's needs and meets the standards specified in § 220.18(c) will be provided if needed. When more than one kind of child care is available, the mother or other caretaker relative may choose the type, but may not refuse to accept child care services if they are available; and

(ii) Self-support services as needed will be continued during the individual's participation in the WIN program and after entry into employment until he has completed the job entry period or has been terminated from WIN by the manpower agency, according to definitions established by the Department of Labor;

(5) Certifying in writing to the manpower agency that the individual is ready for employment or training under the WIN program, when the manpower agency requests such certification and the supportive services,

if any, have been provided or arranged for. Unemployed fathers must be certified within 30 days after receipt of aid. Failure to certify 15 percent of the average number of individuals in the State who are required to be registered during any fiscal year after June 30, 1973, will result in a proportionate reduction in Federal funds for assistance payments (see § 233.10(b) (5) of this chapter) ; and

(6) Providing counseling and other services, for a period of 60 days, to individuals determined by the Secretary of Labor to have refused training or employment under the WIN program without good cause, for the purpose of persuading them to accept appropriate training or employment (see § 233.77 (f) of this chapter for sanctions). Under this requirement, once a period of counseling and other services has been provided to an individual, and he has again been found by the Secretary of Labor to have refused training or employment under WIN without good cause, the agency shall not provide another period of counseling and other services, unless it is warranted by unusual circumstances.

(c) The State agency will assure a non-Federal contribution to the manpower agency for 10 percent of the cost of operations of the WIN program, and, for this purpose, will plan jointly with the manpower agency for the development and use of in-kind resources. (See § 220.36.) The State agency must make the arrangements for, but need not itself make the contribution.

[37 F.R. 12200, June 20, 1972]

§ 220.36 Non-Federal contribution.

For purposes of § 220.35(c) :

(a) Except as specifically authorized by Federal statute, a non-Federal contribution may not include funds or expenditures which are used to meet the Federal or State share of other programs receiving Federal financial assistance.

(b) The non-Federal contribution may be in cash or in-kind. A contribution in-kind may be made in the form of the provision of services, staff, space, equipment, or any other goods or services of value essential to the operation of the work incentive program. Where such contribution is in-kind, the amount thereof will be determined on the basis of its reasonable value as established by suitable documentation.

(c) The costs of operation of the work incentive program which may be met by the non-Federal contribution may include the costs of training, supervision, materials, administration, incentive payments, transportation, and other items as are authorized by the manpower agency, but may not include any reimbursement for time spent by participants in work, training, or other participation in such program.

(d) If the State agency fails to make arrangements for the non-Federal contribution of 10 percent of the total statewide work incentive program costs of operation, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may withhold under the conditions specified in the law the equivalent of amounts to be paid from the grants to the State agency for the public assistance titles.

* * * * * * *

Subpart B—Optional Provisions

* * * * * * *

SERVICES IN AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN

§ 220.51 Range of optional services.

(a) The Social Security Act (sec. 406(d)) defines the full range of family services in AFDC as follows: "* * * services to a family or any member thereof for the purpose of preserving, rehabilitating, reuniting, or strengthening the family, and such other services as will assist members of a family to attain or retain capability for the maximum self-support and personal independence."

(b) The full range of or selected family services, and child welfare services as defined in this subpart may be included except for those services excluded in § 220.61.

(c) Following are types of selected services:

(1) *Child care services.* Child care services provided to families other than those required in § 220.15, must meet the standards required in that section.

* * * * * * *

§ 220.52 Coverage of optional groups for services.

(a) The agency may elect to provide services to all or to reasonably classified subgroups of the following:

(1) Families and children who are current applicants for financial assistance.

(2) Families and children who are former applicants or recipients of financial assistance.

(3) Families and children who are likely to become applicants for or recipients of financial assistance, i.e., those who:

(i) Are eligible for medical assistance, as medically needy persons, under the State's title XIX plan.

(ii) Would be eligible for financial assistance if the earnings exemption granted to recipients applied to them.

(iii) Are likely, within 5 years, to become recipients of financial assistance.

(iv) Are at or near dependency level, including those in low-income neighborhoods and among other groups that might otherwise include more AFDC cases, where services are provided on a group basis.

(4) All other families and children for information and referral service only.

(b) All families and children in the above groups, or a selected reasonable classification of families and children with common problems or common service needs, may be included.

CHILD WELFARE SERVICES

* * * * * * *

§ 220.55 Range of optional services and groups to be served.

(a) The Social Security Act (sec. 425) defines the full range of child welfare services as follows: "* * * public social services which supplement, or substitute for, (1) parental care and supervision for the purpose of preventing or remedying, or assisting in the solution of problems which may result in the neglect, abuse, exploitation, or delinquency of children, (2) protecting and caring for homeless, dependent, or neglected children, (3) protecting and promoting the welfare of children of working mothers, and (4) otherwise protecting and promoting the welfare of children, including the strengthening of their own homes where possible or, where needed, the provision of adequate care of children away from their homes in foster family homes or day care or other child care facilities."

§ 220.56 Day care services.

(a) If day care services are included under title IV-B, they must meet the standards required in § 220.18(c)(2), and in addition, the State plan must indicate compliance with the following:

(1) Cooperative arrangements with State health and education agencies to assure maximum utilization of such agencies in the provision of health and education services for children in day care.

(2) An advisory committee on day care services as set forth in § 220.4(b).

(3) A reasonable and objective method for determining the priorities of need, as a basis for giving priority, in determining the existence of need for day care, to members of low-income or other groups in the population and to geographical areas which have the greatest relative need for the extension of day care.

(4) Specific criteria for determining the need of each child for care and protection through day care services.

(5) Determination that day care is in the best interests of the child and the family.

(6) Provision for determining on an objective basis, the ability of families to pay for part or all of the cost of day care and for payment of reasonable fees by families able to pay.

(7) Provision for the development and implementation of arrangements for the more effective involvement of the parent or parents in the appropriate care of the child and the improvement of his health and development.

(8) Provision of day care only in facilities (including private homes) which are licensed by the State or approved as meeting the standards for such licensing.

* * * * * * *

Subpart C—Federal Financial Participation

§ 220.60 General.

The regulations in this subpart deal separately with Federal financial participation in the costs of services under the AFDC and Child Welfare Services programs because these programs have different legal provisions governing the extent of Federal funding. However, in general there are no differences in the kinds of services or methods of providing services under these two programs.

§ 220.61 Federal financial participation; AFDC.

(a) *General.* Federal financial participation is available in expenditures, as found necessary by the Secretary:

(1) For the proper and efficient administration of the plan;

(2) For the costs of providing the services for the groups of families and children;

(3) For carrying out the activities described in subparts A and B of these regulations that are included in the approved State plan. Such participation will be at the rates prescribed in this subpart.

(b) *Persons eligible for service.* Federal financial participation is available under this section only for services provided to:

(1) A child or relative who is receiving aid under the plan and to any essential person living in the same household as such relative and child.

(2) The groups defined in § 220.52: current applicants for aid, former and potential applicants or recipients and other individuals requesting information and referral service only. In respect to any child or relative who has formerly been an applicant for or recipient of aid, counseling and casework services may be provided. Other services may be provided only to those children or relatives who have received aid within the previous 2 years or who qualify under the definition of potential applicants or recipients.

(c) *Sources for furnishing services.* Federal financial participation is available under this section for services furnished:

(1) By State or local agency staff, i.e., full- or part-time employed staff; and volunteers, or

(2) By purchase contract, or other cooperative arrangements with public or private agencies or individuals, provided that such services are not available without cost from such sources.

(d) *Provisions governing costs of certain services.* (1) Medical and assistance costs. Federal financial participation under this section will not be available in expenditures for subsistence and other assistance items or for medical or remedial care or services, except:

(i) For subsistence and medical care when they are provided as essential components of a comprehensive service program of a facility and their costs are not separately identifiable, such as, in a rehabilitation center, a day care facility or a maternity home;

(ii) For medical and remedial care and services as part of family planning services;

(iii) For required medical examinations for persons caring for children under agency auspices, when not otherwise available or not included in purchase arrangements;

(iv) For identifying medical problems of children in child care facilities; or

(v) For medical diagnosis and consultation when necessary to carry out service responsibilities, e.g., for recipients under consideration for referral to training and employment programs.

(2) Vocational rehabilitation services. Federal financial participation is not available in the costs of providing services for the disabled as defined in the Vocational Rehabilitation Act except pursuant to an agreement with the State agency administering the vocational rehabilitation program. This applies to provision of services by staff of the agency and purchase.

(3) Federal financial participation is available in the costs of the following:

(i) Staff is providing services related to foster care, i.e., recruitment, study, and approval of foster family homes, services to children in foster care and their parents, and work with foster parents and staff of child-caring institutions. Vendor payments for foster care are assistant payments and are, therefore, not subject to the service rate of Federal financial participation.

(ii) Work related to child care resources to be used by the agency, i.e., the costs of staff engaged in the development, recruitment, study, approval, and subsequent evaluation of out-of-home child care resources, except the costs of staff primarily engaged in the issuance of licenses or in the enforcement of standards; study, approval, and subsequent evaluation of in-home care arrangements; and in the provision of technical assistance to improve the quality of child care.

(iii) Services provided in behalf of families and children, e.g., community planning, assuring accessibility to entitled service resources; and studies of service needs and results.

(iv) Certain services to assist individuals to achieve employment and self-sufficiency:

(*a*) Payments for additional expenses of individuals that are attributable to their participation in training or work experience projects, e.g., transportation, lunches, uniforms. (Not applicable to assistance recipients earning wages, including employment or on-the-job training, or on special work projects under Work Incentive Program, since such expenses will be deducted in determining net income.)

(*b*) Medical examinations that are necessary to determine physical and mental health conditions for training or employment.

(*c*) Education and training as provided in § 220.51(c)(3).

(v) Agency staff engaged in locating and planning with deserting or putative fathers; assessing potentials and determining appropriate actions; developing voluntary support; assisting relatives to file petitions for the establishment of paternity; reuniting families; and cooperative planning with appropriate courts and law enforcement officials.

(e) *Kinds of expenses for which Federal financial participation is available.* (1) Salary and travel costs of service workers and their supervisors giving full-time to services and for staff entirely engaged (either at State or local level) in developing, planning, and evaluating services. Where a full-time service worker also carries services under the adult categories, the portion applicable to AFDC (IV–A) is at AFDC rates.

(2) Salary costs of service-related staff such as, supervisors, clerks, secretaries, and stenographers, which represent that portion of the time spent in supporting full-time service staff.

(3) Related expenses of staff performing service or service-related work under subparagraph (1) or (2) of this paragraph (e) in proportion to their time spent on services, such as communications, equipment, supplies and office space.

(4) Definitions: Applicable to staff performing service functions.

(i) *Full-time service work.* (*a*) Persons performing full time on functions related to the provisions of service means persons assigned on a full-time basis to such functions (services under the adult categories may also be carried).

(*b*) It is not necessary to maintain daily time records for this purpose but it is expected that States will check periodically to assure that persons assigned on a full-time basis are performing substantially on this basis.

(*c*) A full-time service worker can be expected to receive questions from recipients (and former or potential) related to eligibility and the amount of payment or medical benefits and to make this information available to staff responsible for eligibility and related functions. Such workers may not carry the responsibility for securing information or taking the actions in respect to determining initial and continuing eligibility for financial or medical assistance or to change the amount of financial assistance being provided.

(ii) *Meaning and illustrations of service work.* Service work means activity of staff in providing the services and carrying out the related responsibilities specified in subparts A and B. This includes activities of such staff as caseworkers, homemakers, child care personnel, Work Incentive Program coordinators, and community planning staff.

(iii) *Meaning and illustrations of service-related work.* Service-related work means activity of staff other than service workers which is necessary to administer a service program fully. This includes secretaries, stenographers and clerks serving service staff, supervisors of service workers and their supervisors, staff responsible for developing and evaluating service policies, and staff collecting and summarizing financial and statistical data on services, either at the State or local level.

(iv) *Staff.* Staff performing service or service-related work includes professional, subprofessional (e.g., recipients and other workers of low income), and volunteer staff.

(5) Other expenses related to the provision of service in support of full-time service staff, including a portion of the salary costs of any agency person (except the service worker who must be on a full-time basis) who is working part time on service functions (either at the State or local agency level). Such expenses include the portion of salary costs of supervisors related to supervision of service work, a portion of fiscal costs related to services, a portion of research costs related to services, a portion of salary costs of field staff, etc.

(6) Costs of services purchased.

(7) Travel and related costs for children and parents to obtain consultation, medical, and other services.

(8) Costs of State and local advisory committees including expenses of attending meetings, supportive staff and other technical assistance.

(9) Costs of administrative and supervisory staff attending meetings pertinent to the development or implementation of Federal or State service policies and programs.

(10) Costs of operation of agency facilities, used solely for the provision of services. Costs may include expenditures for staff; space, including minor remodeling, heat, utilities, and cleaning furnishings; program supplies, equipment and materials; food and food preparation; and liability and other insurance protection. Costs of construction and major renovations are not matchable as services. Appropriate distribution of costs is necessary when other agencies use such facilities for the provision of their services, such as in comprehensive neighborhood service centers.

(11) Child care expenditures for WIN participants must be charged as a service expenditure and separately identified since Federal funds for this purpose come from a separate appropriation. Child care expenditures for other AFDC cases may be charged as a service expenditure or included as a financial assistance expenditure subject to matching under the title IV–A formula, depending on how the State plan specifies. Where child care is provided as a service the payment may be made either to the vendor of the service directly or to the recipient for payment by him. In either case documentation is needed in the form of statements of the type and quantity of services rendered for each recipient (receipted by vendor when the service

payment is made directly to the recipient) to establish the fact that the expenditure was for services.

(f) *Rates of Federal financial participation.* (1) (i) Federal financial participation at the 75 percent rate is available for the service costs identified in paragraphs (d) and (e) of this section; and for training and staff development including costs of training provided to welfare staff by courts or law enforcement officials.

(ii) With respect to Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, the Federal share:

(*a*) For services and training and staff development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and subsequent years, is 60 percent, except 75 percent for emergency assistance in the form of services.

(*b*) For family planning services and referral for participation under the Work Incentive Program for any fiscal year beginning on or after July 1, 1967 to:

(*1*) Puerto Rico shall not exceed $2 million.

(*2*) The Virgin Islands shall not exceed $65,000.

(*3*) Guam shall not exceed $90,000.

(2) Time limited rates are applicable to certain service costs. The total costs of salaries and travel of workers carrying responsibility for both services and eligibility functions and supervisory costs related to such workers, and all or part of the salaries of supporting secretarial, stenographic, or clerical staff depending on whether they work full-time or part-time for the workers specified in this subparagraph (2), are subject to the following rates of Federal financial participation:

(i) 75 percent for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969 (57 percent for Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam).

(ii) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, at a rate, determined in accordance with standards and methods prescribed by the Secretary from time to time, which gives due regard to the amount of services furnished.

(iii) 50 percent for all subsequent years.

(3) For the period January 1, 1968, through June 30, 1968, Federal financial participation is available at the 75 percent rate for expenditures for services included in a State plan approved under the service policies previously in effect, except that the rate of 85 percent is applicable to expenditures for services furnished under an approved plan pursuant to section 402(a) (14) and (15) of the Social Security Act. However, Federal financial participation is not available for the purchase of service prior to June 10, 1968 from sources other than State agencies.

(4) Federal financial participation at the 50 percent rate is available in the costs of the following activities that are separate from but relevant to the costs of services;

(i) Salaries and travel of staff primarily engaged in determining eligibility and their supervisors and supporting staff (clerks, secretaries, stenographers, etc.).

(ii) Salaries and travel of staff primarily engaged in developing eligibility provisions and the determination processes (either at the State or local agency level).

(iii) Expenses related to such staff, and for staff specified in paragraph (f) (2) of this section, such as for communications, equipment, supplies and office space.

(iv) Costs of State or local staff engaged in the collection of support and accounting for such funds and determining the effect of support funds on eligibility or assistance payments. No Federal financial participation is available in the costs of agency staff engaged in apprehension, arrests, or enforcement activities.

(v) Subject to paragraph (f)(5) of this section, cost, both direct and indirect, of reimbursing courts and law-enforcement officials under plans of cooperation approved by the single State agency for their assistance to the State or local agency in respect to its program to secure support and establish paternity, including costs of training provided to court and law-enforcement officials.

(vi) Costs of Emergency services to needy families with children.

(vii) Other expenses of administration not specified at the 75 percent rate for services.

(5) The ordinary administrative costs of the judiciary system are not subject to reimbursement.

(g) *Federal financial participation in the work incentive program.* (1) Federal financial participation at the rate of 90 percent is available in the costs of self-support services (and the related administrative costs) provided by the separate administrative units in accordance with § 220.35(b)(4).

(2) The amount of Federal funds available for Federal financial participation at the rate of 90 percent, as appropriated by Congress, will be apportioned among the States according to methods prescribed by the Secretary.

(3) This paragraph does not apply to Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam.

§ 220.62 Federal financial participation; CWS.

(a) *Federal share.* The Federal share of service programs under title IV–B shall be at the rate specified in or promulgated pursuant to section 423 of the Act.

(b) *Persons eligible for service.* (1) Federal financial participation under title IV–B is available to serve all families and children in need of child welfare services without respect to whether they are receiving AFDC.

(2) Expenditures for care of children in foster family homes, group homes, institutions, family day care homes or day care centers, or for care of unmarried mothers in foster family homes, group homes, institutions, or independent or other living situations, shall be for those children or unmarried mothers for whom the public welfare agency, through its child welfare services program, accepts responsibility for providing or purchasing such care. This responsibility includes: determining the need for such care and that the type of care is in the best interest of the child and his family or of the unmarried mother; determining the ability of the family to contribute to the cost of care; and developing a plan for continuing supervision of the child or unmarried mother in care.

(c) *Sources of services.* Federal financial participation is available under this section for services furnished:

(1) By State or local agency staff, i.e., full- or part-time employed staff, and volunteers, or

(2) By purchase, contract, or other cooperative arrangements with public or private agencies or individuals, provided that such services are not available without cost from such sources.

(d) *Kinds of expenses included.* Federal financial participation is available for expenditures for the following purposes: personnel services; professional education; institutes, conferences and short-term courses; foster care of children; care of unmarried mothers; day care of children; purchase of homemaker services; specialized services; return of runaway children; research and special facilitative services; merit system costs; advisory committees; membership fees; supplies, equipment and communication; and occupancy and maintenance of space.

§ 220.63 Relationship of costs under parts A and B of title IV.

(a) There must be methods of allocating the costs of providing services under the child welfare services program and providing services under the AFDC program.

(b) Service expenses that jointly benefit title IV–A and B programs may be allocated between them using any reasonable basis or may be charged entirely to IV–A or B if they are considered to be of primary benefit to such program. The title IV–A program may be considered to be primarily benefited if the number of AFDC children served represents at least 85 percent of the total children served. The 85 percent computation may be based on local agency totals or on statewide totals.

(c) The one exception to the policy expressed above in paragraph (b) of this section pertains to educational leave. States can elect to charge educational leave totally either to AFDC under title IV–A or child welfare services under title IV–B, without regard to the proportion of time devoted to either program before or after educational leave. The only condition to be met is that the person returning from educational leave be employed in the single organizational unit supervising or providing all services for families and children under title IV–A and/or title IV–B of the Social Security Act, as amended. Where a single organization unit has not been established an allocation of costs must be made in accordance with existing policy.

§ 220.64 Provisions common to title IV–A and B.

(a) Expenditures for certain functions under both parts A and B of title IV shall be in accordance with the other provisions governing:

(1) Employee benefit costs; as described in "Federal Participation in Costs of Employee Benefit Systems."

(2) Organization memberships; as described in "Federal Participation in Costs of State Agency Memberships in Organizations."

(3) Occupancy or maintenance of space; as described in "Expenditures by State or Granted Funds for Occupancy and Maintenance of Space."

(b) (1) Donated private funds for services may be considered as State funds in claiming Federal reimbursement where such funds are:

(i) Transferred to the State or local agency and under its administrative control; and

(ii) Donated on an unrestricted basis (except that funds donated to support a particular kind of activity, e.g., day care, or to support a particular kind of activity in a named community, are acceptable provided the donating organization is not the sponsor or operator of the activity being funded).

(2) Donated private funds for services may not be considered as State funds in claiming Federal reimbursement where such funds are:

(i) Contributed funds which revert to the donor's facility or use.

(ii) Donated funds which are earmarked for a particular individual or for members of a particular organization.

§ 220.65 Amount of Federal funding.

(a) The amount of Federal funds available for services under title IV–A is dependent upon the availability of and extent of matching State funds, except as stated in § 220.61(f), for Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, and Guam.

(b) The amount of Federal funds under title IV–B may not exceed the amount available under the allotment formula prescribed by law. The availability of these funds is dependent upon matching State funds determined according to the formula prescribed by law.

* * * * * * *

Subpart D—Other Provisions Governing Child Welfare Services Programs

§ 220.70 Meaning of terms.

Unless the context otherwise requires, the following terms, as used in this subpart have the following meanings:

(a) "Act" means title IV, part B of the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 601–626.

(b) "Social and Rehabilitation Service" means the Social and Rehabilitation Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(c) "State" means the several States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam.

(d) "State agency" means the public welfare agency of a State which has been designated as the single agency for the purpose of administering or supervising the administration of a State plan for child welfare services.

(e) "Local agency" means the public welfare agency of a political subdivision of a State which is engaged in the administration of that part of the State plan that pertains to the locality and which, in such administration, is under the supervision of the State agency.

(f) "Official forms" means forms supplied by the Social and Rehabilitation Service to State agencies for submitting required information and requests.

(g) "Children" means those individuals under the age of 21 years who are homeless, dependent, neglected or in danger of becoming delinquent regardless of the fact that they also may fall into other categories, and for whom services under the State program of child welfare services are authorized by State law.

(h) "Child welfare services" means public social services which supplement, or substitute for, parental care and supervision for the purposes set forth in section 425 of the Act.

(i) "Establishing, extending, and strengthening" means stabilizing, increasing where necessary and desirable the applicability of, and making stronger the State program of child welfare services and undertaking new child welfare services where necessary and desirable for meeting the unmet needs of children.

(j) "State plan" means the plan developed jointly by the State agency and the Social and Rehabilitation Service for establishing, extending and strengthening the State program of child welfare services, taking into account the condition of such program, the needs of children and the potential for meeting the unmet needs of children through Federal financial participation. It includes the basic plan and the annual budget pursuant to § 220.71.

APPENDIX I

Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements

Code of Federal Regulations, Title 45, Subtitle A

Part 71—Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements

Subpart A—General

Sec.

71.1 Definitions.
71.2 Scope and purpose.
71.3 Application or requirements.
71.4 Waiver of requirements.
71.5 Effective date of requirements.
71.6 Enforcement of requirements.

Subpart B—Comprehensive and Coordinated Services

71.10 Types of facilities.
71.11 Grouping of children.
71.12 Licensing or approval of facilities as meeting the standards for such licensing.
71.13 Environmental standards.
71.14 Educational services.
71.15 Social services.
71.16 Health and nutrition services.
71.17 Training of staff.
71.18 Parent involvement.
71.19 Administration and coordination.
71.20 Evaluation.

AUTHORITY: The provisions of this Part 71 issued under sec. 522(d), 81 Stat. 713, sec. 602, 78 Stat. 528, 42 U.S.C. 2932(d), 2942; sec. 1102, 49 Stat. 647, 42 U.S.C. 1302; sec. 7, 64 Stat. 1107 as renumbered sec. 301, 79 Stat. 35, 20 U.S.C. 242; sec. 1001(c), 80 Stat. 1475, sec. 14, 79 Stat. 80 42 U.S.C. 2610c, 2616.

SOURCE: The provisions of this Part 71 appear at 34 F.R. 1390, Jan. 29, 1969, unless otherwise noted.

Subpart A—General

§ 71.1 *Definitions*

As used in this part:

(a) "Day care services" means comprehensive and coordinated sets of activities providing direct care and protection of infants, preschool and school-age children outside of their own homes during a portion of a 24-hour day. (The Office of Economic Opportunity uses 7 hours as the minimum time period for its preschool day care programs; however, most of the standards in this document are also applicable to part-day Head Start programs.) Comprehensive services include, but are not limited to, educational, social, health, and nutritional services and parent participation. Such services require provision of supporting activities including administration, coordination, admissions, training and evaluation.

(b) "Administering agency" means any agency which either directly or indirectly receives Federal funds for day care services subject to the Federal Interagency Day Care Standards and which has ultimate responsibility for the conduct of such a program. Administering agencies may receive Federal funds through a State agency or directly from the Federal Government. There may be more than one administering agency in a single community.

(c) "Operating agency" means an agency directly providing day care services with funding from an administering agency. In some cases, the administering and operating agencies may be the same, e.g., public welfare departments or community action agencies which directly operate programs. Portions of the required services may be performed by the administering agency.

(d) "Day care facility" means the place where day care services are provided to children; e.g., family day care homes, group day care homes, and day care centers. Facilities do not necessarily provide the full range of day care services. Certain services may be provided by the administering or operating agency.

(e) "Standards." Standards consist of both interagency requirements and recommendations. The requirements only are presented in this document; the recommendations will be issued separately.

(1) "Interagency requirements" means a mandatory policy which is applicable to all programs and facilities funded in whole or in part through Federal appropriations.

(2) "Interagency recommendations" means an optional policy based on what is known or generally held to be valid for child growth and development which is recommended by the Federal agencies and which administering agencies should strive to achieve.

§ 71.2 *Scope and purpose*

The legislative mandates of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 require that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity coordinate programs under their jurisdictions which provide day care so as to obtain, if possible, a common set of program standards and regulations and to establish mechanisms for coordination at State and local levels. The Secretary of Labor has joined with the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in approving these standards. Accordingly, this part sets forth Federal interagency requirements which day care programs must meet if they are receiving funds under any of the following programs:

(a) Title IV of the Social Security Act: Part A—Aid to Families With Dependent Children; Part B—Child Welfare Services.

(b) Title I of the Economic Opportunity Act—Youth Programs.

(c) Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act—Urban and Rural Community Action Programs.

(d) Title III of the Economic Opportunity Act—Part B—Assistance for Migrant, and other Seasonally Employed, Farmworkers and Their Families. (These Federal interagency requirements will not apply in full to migrant programs until July 1, 1969.)

(e) Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act—Part B—Day Care Projects.

(f) Manpower Development and Training Act.

(g) Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. (Programs funded under this title may be subject to these requirements at the discretion of the State and local education agencies administering these funds.)

§ 71.3 *Application of requirements*

(a) As a condition for Federal funding, agencies administering day care programs must assure that the requirements are met in all facilities which the agencies establish, operate or utilize with Federal support. If a facility does not provide all of the required services, the administering agency must assure that those that are lacking are otherwise provided.

(b) Administering agencies must develop specific requirements and procedures within the framework of the Federal interagency requirements and recommendations to maintain, extend, and improve their day care services. Additional standards developed locally may be higher than the Federal requirements and must be at least equal to those required for licensing or approval as meeting the standards established for such licensing. Under no circumstances may they be lower. It is the intent of the Federal Government to raise and never to lower the level of day care services in any State.

(c) The interagency requirements will be utilized by Federal agencies in the evaluation of operating programs.

(d) The provisions of this part cover all day care programs and facilities utilized by the administering agencies which receive Federal funds, whether these facilities are operated directly by the administering agencies or whether contracted to other agencies. Such programs and facilities must also be licensed or meet the standards of licensing applicable in the State. Day care may be provided:

(1) On a day care facility operated by the administering agency.

(2) In a day care facility operated by a public, voluntary, or proprietary organization which enters into a contract to accept children from the administering agency and to provide care for them under the latter's policies. (The operating organization may also serve children who are not supported by the administering agency.)

(3) Through some other contractual or other arrangement, including the use of an intermediary organization designed to provide coordinated day care services, or the use of facilities provided by employers, labor unions, or joint employer—union organizations.

(4) Through the purchase of care by an individual receiving aid to families with dependent children or child welfare services funds for the service.

§ 71.4 *Waiver of requirements*

Requirements can be waived when the administering agency can show that the requested waiver may advance innovation and experimentation and extend services without loss of quality in the facility. Waivers must be consistent with the provisions of law. Requests for waivers should be addressed to the regional office of the Federal agency which is providing the funds. Requirements of the licensing authority in a State cannot be waived by the Federal regional office.

§ 71.5 *Effective date of requirements*

The requirements apply to all day care programs initially funded and to those refunded after July 1, 1968. Administering agencies are expected to immediately initiate planning and action to achieve full compliance within a reasonable time. Except where noted, up to 1 year may be allowed for compliance provided there is evidence of progress and good intent to comply.

§ 71.6 *Enforcement of requirements*

(a) The basic responsibility for enforcement of the requirements lies with the administering agency. Acceptance of Federal funds is an agreement to abide by the requirements. State agencies are expected to review programs and facilities at the local level for which they have responsibility and make sure that the requirements are met. Noncompliance may be grounds for suspension or termination of Federal funds.

(b) The Federal agencies acting in concert will also plan to review the operation of selected facilities.

Subpart B—Comprehensive and Coordinated Services

§ 71.10 *Types of facilities*

It is expected that a community program of day care services will require more than one type of day care facility if the particular needs of each child and his parents are to be taken into consideration. Listed in this section are the three major types of day care facilities to which the Federal requirements apply. They are defined in terms of the nature of care offered. While it is preferable that the three types of facilities be available, this is not a requirement.

(a) The family day care home serves only as many children as it can integrate into its own physical setting and pattern of living. It is especially suitable for infants, toddlers, and sibling groups and for neghborhood-based day care programs, including those for children needing after-school care. A family day care home may serve no more than six children (3 through 14) in total (no more than five when the age range is infancy through six), including the family day care mother's own children.

(b) The group day care home offers family-like care, usually to school-age children, in an extended or modified family residence. It utilized one or several employees and provides care for up to 12 children. It is suitable for children who need before- and after-school care, who do not require a great deal of mothering or individual care, and who can profit from considerable association with their peers.

(c) The day care center serves groups of 12 or more children. It utilizes subgroupings on the basis of age and special need but provides opportunity for the experience and learning that accompany a mixing of ages. Day care centers should not accept children under 3 years of age unless the care available approximates the mothering in the family home. Centers do not usually attempt to simulate family living. Centers may be established in a variety of places: private dwellings, settlement houses, schools, churches, social centers, public housing units, specially constructed facilities, etc.

§ 71.11 *Grouping of children*

The administering agency, after determining the kind of facility to be used, must ensure that the following limits on size of groups and child-to-adult ratios are observed. All new facilities must meet the requirements prior to Federal funding. Existing programs may be granted up to 3 years to meet this requirement, if evidence of progress and good intent is shown.

(a) Family day care home:

(1) Infancy through 6 years. No more than two children under two and no more than five in total, including the family day care mother's own children under 14 years old.

(2) Three through 14 years. No more than six children, including the family day care mother's children under 14 years old.

(3) (i) In the use of a family day care home, there must always be provision for another adult on whom the family day care mother can call in case of an emergency or illness.

(ii) There are circumstances where it would be necessary to have on a regular basis two adults in a family day care home; for example, if one or more of the children were retarded, emotionally disturbed, or handicapped and needed more than usual care.

(iii) The use of volunteers is very appropriate in family day care. Volunteers may include older children who are often very successful in working with younger children when under adequate supervision.

(b) Group day care home:

(1) Three through 14 years. Groups may range up to 12 children but the child—staff ratio never exceeds six to one. No child under three should be in this type of care. When preschool children are cared for, the child—staff ratio should not exceed five to one.

(2) (i) Volunteers and aides may be used to assist the adult responsible for the group. Teenagers are often highly successful in working with younger children, but caution should be exercised in giving them supervisory responsibility over their peers.

(ii) As in family day care, provision must be made for other adults to be called in case of an emergency or illness.

(c) Day care center:

(1) Three to 4 years. No more than 15 in a group with an adult and sufficient assistants, supplemented by volunteers, so that the total ratio of children to adults is normally not greater than 5 to 1.

(2) Four to 6 years. No more than 20 in a group with an adult and sufficient assistants, supplemented by volunteers, so that the total ratio of children to adults is normally not greater than 7 to 1.

(3) Six through 14 years. No more than 25 in a group with an adult and sufficient assistants, supplemented by volunteers, so that the total ratio of children to adults is normally not greater than 10 to 1.

(4) (i) The adult is directly responsible for supervising the daily program for the children in her group and the work of the assistants and volunteers assigned to her. She also works directly with the children and their parents, giving as much individual attention as possible.

(ii) Volunteers may be used to supplement the paid staff responsible for the group. They may include older children who are often highly successful in working with younger children. Caution should be exercised in assigning teenagers supervisory responsibility over their peers.

(d) Federal interagency requirements have not been set for center care of children under 3 years of age. If programs offer center care for children younger than 3, State licensing regulations and requirements must be met. Center care for children under 3 cannot be offered if the State authority has not established acceptable standards for such care.

§ 71.12 *Licensing or approval of facilities as meeting the standards for such licensing*

Day care facilities must be licensed or approved as meeting the standards for such licensing. If the State licensing law does not fully cover the licensing of these facilities, acceptable standards must be developed by the licensing authority or the State welfare department and each facility must meet these standards if it is to receive Federal funds.

§ 71.13 *Environmental standards*

(a) *Location of day care facilities.* (1) Members of low income or other groups in the population and geographic areas who (i) are eligible under the regulations of the funding agency and (ii) have the greatest relative need must be given priority in the provision of day care services.

(2) In establishing or utilizing a day care facility, all the following factors must be taken into consideration:

(i) Travel time for both the children and their parents.

(ii) Convenience to the home or worksite of parents to enable them to participate in the program.

(iii) Provision of equal opportunities for people of all racial, cultural, and economic groups to make use of the facility.

(iv) Accessibility of other resources which enhance the day care program.

(v) Opportunities for involvement of the parents and the neighborhood.

(3) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 requires that services in programs receiving Federal funds are used and available without discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin.

(b) Safety and sanitation. (1) The facility and grounds used by the children must meet the requirements of the appropriate safety and sanitation authorities.

(2) Where safety and sanitation codes applicable to family day care homes, group day care homes, or day care centers do not exist or are not being implemented, the operating agency or the administering agency must work with the appropriate safety and sanitation authorities to secure technical advice which will enable them to provide adequate safeguards.

(c) *Suitability of facilities.* Each facility must provide space and equipment for free play, rest, privacy and a range of indoor and outdoor program activities suited to the children's ages and the size of the group. There must be provisions for meeting the particular needs of those handicapped children enrolled in the program. Minimum requirements include:

(1) Adequate indoor and outdoor space for children appropriate to their ages, with separate rooms or areas for cooking, toilets and other purposes.

(2) Floors and walls which can be fully cleaned and maintained and which are nonhazardous to the children's clothes and health.

(3) Ventilation and temperature adequate for each child's safety and comfort.

(4) Safe and comfortable arrangements for naps for young children.

(5) Space for isolation of the child who becomes ill, to provide him with quiet and rest and reduce the risk of infection or contagion to others.

§ 71.14 *Educational services*

(a) Educational opportunities must be provided every child. Such opportunities should be appropriate to the child's age regardless of the type of facility in which he is enrolled; i.e., family day care home, group day care home, or day care center.

(b) Educational activities must be under the supervision and direction of a staff member trained or experienced in child growth and development. Such supervision may be provided from a central point for day care homes.

(c) The persons providing direct care for children in the facility must have had training or demonstrated ability in working with children.

(d) Each facility must have toys, games, equipment and material, books, etc., for educational development and creative expression appropriate to the particular type of facility and age level of the children.

(e) The daily activities for each child in the facility must be designed to influence a positive concept of self and motivation and to enhance his social, cognitive, and communication skills.

§ 71.15 *Social services*

(a) Provision must be made for social services which are under the supervision of a staff member trained or experienced in the field. Services may be provided in the facility or by the administering or operating agency.

(b) Nonprofessionals must be used in productive roles to provide social services.

(c) Counseling and guidance must be available to the family to help it determine the appropriateness of day care, the best facility for a particular child, and the possibility of alternative plans for care. The staff must also develop effective programs of referral to additional resources which meet family needs.

(d) Continuing assessment must be made with the parents of the child's adjustment in the day care program and of the family situation.

(e) There must be procedures for coordination and cooperation with other organizations offering those resources which may be required by the child and his family.

(f) Where permitted by Federal agencies providing funds, provision should be made for an objective system to determine the ability of families to pay for part or all of the cost of day care and for payment.

§ 71.16 *Health and nutrition services*

(a) The operating or administering agency must assure that the health of the children and the safety of the environment are supervised by a qualified physician.

(b) Each child must receive dental, medical, and other health evaluations appropriate to his age upon entering day care and subsequently at intervals appropriate to his age and state of health. (If the child entering day care has not recently had a comprehensive health evaluation by a physician, this should be provided promptly after he enters a day care program.)

(c) Arrangements must be made for medical and dental care and other health related treatment for each child, using existing community resources. In the absence of other financial resources, the operating or administering agency must provide, whenever authorized by law, such treatment with its own funds. (The day care agency, in those instances where Federal funds are legally available to be expended for health services, has the ultimate responsibility of ensuring that no child is denied health services because his parents are unable to carry out an adequate health plan. Funds for aid to families with dependent children are not legally available for health care, but States are encouraged to use Medic-aid funds whenever possible.)

(d) The facility must provide a daily evaluation of each child for indications of illness.

(e) The administering or operating agency must ensure that each child has available to him all immunizations appropriate to his age.

(f) Advance arrangements must be made for the care of a child who is injured or becomes ill, including isolation if necessary, notification of his parents, and provisions for emergency medical care or first aid.

(g) The facility must provide adequate and nutritious meals and snacks prepared in a safe and sanitary manner. Consultation should be available from a qualified nutritionist or food service specialist.

(h) All staff members of the facility must be aware of the hazards of infection and accidents and how they can minimize such hazards.

(i) Staff of the facility and volunteers must have periodic assessments, including tuberculin tests or chest X-rays, of their physical and mental competence to care for children.

(j) The operating or administering agency must ensure that adequate health records are maintained on every child and every staff member who has contact with children.

§ 71.17 *Training of staff*

(a) The operating or administering agency must provide or arrange for the provision of orientation, continuous inservice training, and supervision for all staff involved in a day care program—professionals, nonprofessionals, and volunteers—in general program goals as well as specific program areas; i.e., nutrition, health, child growth and development, including the meaning of supplementary care to the child, educational guidance and remedial techniques, and the relation of the community to the child.

(b) Staff must be assigned responsibility for organizing and coordinating the training program.

(c) Nonprofessional staff must be given career progression opportunities which include job upgrading and work-related training and education.

§ 71.18 *Parent involvement*

(a) Opportunities must be provided parents at times convenient to them to work with the program and, whenever possible, to observe their children in the day care facility.

(c) Whenever an agency (i.e., an operating or an administering agency) provides day care for 40 or more children, there must be a policy advisory committee or its equivalent at that administrative level where most decisions are made on the kinds of programs to be operated, the hiring of staff, the budgeting of funds, and the submission of applications to funding agencies. The committee membership should include not less than 50 percent parents or parent representatives, selected by the parents themselves in a democratic fashion. Other members should include representatives of professional organizations or individuals who have particular knowledge or skills in children's and family programs.

(d) Policy advisory committees (the structure of which will vary depending upon the administering agencies and facilities involved) must perform productive functions, including but not limited to:

(1) Assisting in the development of the programs and approving applications for funding.

(2) Participating in the nomination and selection of the program director at the operating and/or administering level.

(3) Advising on the recruitment and selection of staff and volunteers.

(4) Initiating suggestions and ideas for program improvements.

(5) Serving as a channel for hearing complaints on the program.

(6) Assisting in organizing activities for parents.

(7) Assuming a degree of responsibility for communicating with parents and encouraging their participation in the program.

§ 71.19 *Administration and coordination*

(a) *Administration.* (1) The personnel policies of the operating agency must be governed by written policies which provide for job descriptions, qualification requirements, objective review of grievances and complaints, a sound compensation plan, and statements of employee benefits and responsibilities.

(2) The methods of recruiting and selecting personnel must ensure equal opportunity for all interested persons to file an application and have it considered within reasonable criteria. By no later than July 1, 1969, the methods for recruitment and selection must provide for the effective use of nonprofessional positions and for priority in employment to welfare recipients and other low-income people filling those positions.

(3) The staffing pattern of the facility, reinforced by the staffing pattern of the operating and administering agency, must be in reasonable accord with the staffing patterns outlined in the Head Start Manual of Policies and Instructions and/or recommended standards developed by national standard-setting organizations.

(4) In providing day care through purchase of care arrangements or through use of intermediary organizations, the administering agency should allow waivers by the operating agency only with respect to such administrative matters and procedures as are related to their other functions as profit-making or private nonprofit organizations; provided, that in order for substantial Federal funds to be used, such organizations must include provisions for parent participation and opportunities for employment of low-income persons. Similarly, there must be arrangements to provide the total range of required services. All waivers must be consistent with the law.

(5) The operating or administering agency must provide for the development and publication of policies and procedures governing:

(i) Required program services (i.e., health, education, social services, nutrition, parent participation, etc.) and their integration within the total program.

(ii) Intake including eligibility for care and services, and assurance that the program reaches those who need it.

(iii) Financing, including fees, expenditures, budgeting, and procedures needed to coordinate or combine funding within and/or between day care programs.

(iv) Relations with the community, including a system of providing education about the program.

(v) Continuous evaluation, improvement, and development of the program for quality of service and for the expansion of its usefulness.

(vi) Recording and reporting of information required by State and Federal agencies.

(6) The administering and operating agencies and all facilities used by them must comply with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which requires that services in programs receiving Federal funds are used and available without discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin.

(7) Where the administering agency contracts for services with private individuals or proprietary organizations, it must include contractual requirements designed to achieve the objectives of this section.

(b) *Coordination.* (1) Administering agencies must coordinate their program planning to avoid duplication in service and to promote continuity in the care and service for each child.

(2) State administering agencies have a responsibility to develop procedures which will facilitate coordination with other State agencies and with local agencies using Federal funds.

(3) Agencies which operate more than one type of program; e.g., a group day care home as well as day care center programs, are encouraged to share appropriate personnel and resources to gain maximum productivity and efficiency of operation.

§ 71.20 *Evaluation*

(a) Day care facilities must be evaluated periodically in terms of the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements.

(b) Local operators must evaluate their own program activities according to outlines, forms, etc., provided by the operating and administering agencies. This self-evaluation must be periodically planned and scheduled so that results of evaluation can be incorporated into the preparation of the succeeding year's plan.

○